

EXHIBIT 9

REPORT OF DR. ITAMAR SIMONSON

1. I am the Sebastian S. Kresge Professor of Marketing at the Graduate School of Business, Stanford University. A copy of my curriculum vitae, which includes a complete list of my publications, is attached as Exhibit A.

2. I hold a Ph.D. in Marketing from Duke University, Fuqua School of Business, a Master's degree in business administration (MBA) from the UCLA Graduate School of Management, and a Bachelor's degree from The Hebrew University with majors in Economics and Political Science.

3. My field of expertise is consumer behavior, marketing management, survey methods, and human judgment and decision making. Most of my research has focused on buyers' purchasing behavior, the effect of product characteristics (such as brand name, price, and features), the competitive context, and marketing activities (such as promotions, advertising) on buying decisions, and trademark infringement from the customer's perspective.

4. I have received several awards, including (a) the award for the Best Article published in the *Journal of Consumer Research* (the major journal on consumer behavior) between 1987 and 1989; (b) The Ferber Award from the Association for Consumer Research, which is the largest association of consumer researchers in the world; (c) An Honorary Doctorate of the University of Paris – Sorbonne Universities; (d) the 1997 O'Dell Award, given for the *Journal of Marketing Research* (the major journal on marketing research issues) article that has had the greatest impact on the marketing field in the previous five years; (e) the 2001 O'Dell award (and a finalist for the O'Dell Award in 1995, 2002, 2004, 2005, 2007, 2008, and 2012); (f) the award for the Best Article published in the *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* (the main journal on public policy and legal aspects of marketing) between 1993 and 1995; (g) the 2007 Society for Consumer Psychology Distinguished Scientific Achievement Award; (h)

Elected Fellow of the Association for Consumer Research; (i) the 2002 American Marketing Association award for the Best Article in the area of services marketing; and (j) I was a winner in a competition dealing with research on the effectiveness of direct marketing programs, which was organized by the Direct Marketing Association and the Marketing Science Institute. In addition to these awards, my research has been widely cited by other researchers in the marketing, consumer behavior, and other fields,¹ and my publication record has been ranked as one of the most prolific and influential.²

5. At Stanford University I have taught MBA and executive MBA courses on Marketing Management, covering such topics as buyer behavior, developing marketing strategies, new product launch, building brand equity, advertising, sales promotions, and retailing. I also taught an MBA course on Marketing to Businesses, which focuses on the ways in which companies market and recruit business partners and customers, and a course on High Technology Marketing. In addition to teaching MBA courses, I have guided and supervised numerous MBA student teams in their work on company and industry projects dealing with a variety of markets.

6. I have taught several doctoral courses. One doctoral course examines methods for conducting consumer research. It focuses on the various stages involved in a research project, including defining the problem to be investigated, selecting and developing the research approach, data collection and analysis, and deriving conclusions. A second doctoral course that I have taught deals with buyer behavior, covering such topics as buyer decision making processes, influences on purchase decisions, and persuasion. A third doctoral course that I have taught deals with buyer decision making. Prior to joining Stanford University, during the six years that I was on the faculty of the University of California at Berkeley, I taught an

1 See, e.g., Google Scholar (<http://scholar.google.com>).

2 See, e.g., S. Seggie and D. Griffith (2009), "What does it take to get promoted in marketing academia? Understanding exceptional publication productivity in the leading marketing journals," *Journal of Marketing*, 73, 122-132.

MBA Marketing Management course, a Ph.D. course on buyer behavior, and a Ph.D. course on buyer decision making. I also taught in various executive education programs, including a program for marketing managers in high technology companies.

7. After completing my MBA studies and before starting the Ph.D. program, I worked for five years in a marketing capacity in a subsidiary of Motorola Inc., serving in the last two years as the product marketing manager for two-way communications products. My work included (a) defining new products and designing marketing plans for new product introductions, (b) customer and competitor analysis, and (c) sales forecasting.

8. I have conducted, supervised, or evaluated thousands of marketing research surveys, including many related to consumer behavior and information processing, trademarks, branding, marketing strategies, and advertising-related issues. I serve on eight editorial boards, including leading journals such as the Journal of Consumer Research, Journal of Marketing Research, and the Journal of Consumer Psychology. I am also a frequent reviewer of articles submitted to journals in other fields, such as psychology, decision making, and economics. I received (twice) the Outstanding Reviewer Award from the Journal of Consumer Research. As a reviewer, I am asked to evaluate the research of scholars wishing to publish their articles in leading scholarly journals. I have also worked as a consultant for companies and organizations on a variety of marketing and buyer behavior topics. The list of cases in which I provided testimony is included in Exhibit B. My hourly rate is \$750.

9. I was asked by counsel for Google Inc. to conduct a survey of mobile device application developers; the objectives of the survey included (a) assessing the factors that influence developers' decisions whether to develop applications for a new or existing mobile platform, (b) determining developers' reasons for choosing to develop Android applications, (c) evaluating developers' self-assessed ability to learn a new programming language to meet user demand for applications, and (d) understanding developers' behavior (i.e., evidence of actually learning a new programming language to meet demand) pertaining to the tradeoff between

meeting demand and the cost of learning a programming language. Documents that I reviewed in connection with my work in this matter are listed in Exhibit C.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

10. Building on my expertise in the areas of survey design, decision making, and marketing research, I designed a survey to assess the key drivers of application developers' decisions whether to develop applications for a mobile platform. The survey participants were 152 mobile application developers, 76% of whom have developed Android applications. The survey relied on the standard Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) technique.

11. The survey questions addressed the following topics:

- a. The factors or considerations that drive application developers' decisions whether to develop applications for a particular platform.
- b. The factors that led the developers to develop Android applications.
- c. The developers' assessment of their capability to develop applications for a platform that requires learning a new programming language.
- d. The relative importance of six factors, including the demand for applications and prior familiarity with a programming language, that can influence decisions whether to develop applications for a mobile platform.
- e. Behavioral indicators of developers' willingness to learn a new programming language in order to meet user demand for applications.

12. The survey results lead to the following conclusions:

- a. The application developers indicated that the demand (or expected demand) for and profitability of developing applications for a platform are by far the most important drivers of decisions to develop applications for a platform.
- b. By contrast, prior familiarity with a programming language is seldom mentioned as a factor and is, at most, a minor consideration for the overwhelming majority

of application developers.

- c. The great majority of application developers are confident that they are capable of learning a new programming language to meet user demand for applications.
- d. The fact that iOS application developers were willing to learn the Objective-C language and intend to learn the new iOS Swift language provides further evidence that developers do indeed base their decisions on expected demand and economic considerations (e.g., ROI) rather than on whether developing applications requires learning a new language.

13. The survey findings are consistent with other studies of application developers' decision making and with Google's recognition (as reflected in internal documents) that the volume of developed applications is largely driven by the number of Android users.

INTRODUCTION

14. My understanding is that one of the questions to be decided in the present case is whether and to what extent Google's decision to use the Java programming language, and more specifically the structure, sequence, and organization and declaring code in 37 Java API packages ("the Accused APIs"), in Google's Android operating system drove (as Oracle contends) the choices or decisions of application developers to develop Android applications, and consequently, the success of Android in the marketplace. That is, my understanding is that Oracle is alleging that a primary driver of developers' decisions to develop Android applications, and the resulting popularity of Android, was the developers' prior familiarity with the Java programming language, including the Accused APIs. The present survey tests this hypothesis against a straightforward alternative explanation for the decision to develop Android applications based on the simple economic reasoning that anticipated and realized demand and associated profits were the primary drivers of developers' decisions to develop Android applications. That is, one might expect developers to follow demand (and expected growth)

and invest efforts in promising markets and platforms in order to maximize profits and establish themselves in the market, regardless of the programming language involved.

15. Accordingly, I designed a survey of application developers to assess (a) the factors that influence their decisions whether to develop applications for a new platform, (b) their reasons for developing Android applications, (c) their ability to learn a new programming language to meet user demand for applications, and (d) the developers' behavior pertaining to the tradeoff between sales (or market potential) and the cost of learning a programming language.

16. The decision of app developers whether or not to develop applications for a particular platform is similar to numerous other choices people and businesses make. I have conducted numerous studies regarding the manner in which choices are made based on various considerations or attributes, and I have taught courses on this subject since 1987.

17. The proper methodology in this case is a survey in which application developers are asked questions to address the survey's objectives, such as questions about the factors that influence their decisions to develop applications for new platforms. This basic question can be addressed in a number of different ways, as detailed below. In addition, for those application developers who have developed Android applications, the survey can ask them about the factors that influenced their decision to develop for the Android platform. The respondents were 152 application developers, including both those who have chosen to develop Android applications and those who have not developed for Android. Many of the respondents have developed applications for both the iOS and Android platforms (and a small percentage of respondents have developed also for other mobile platforms).

18. The 152 survey respondents are responsible for or influence decisions as to which applications they and/or their firm/team should develop. To obtain a suitable unbiased sample of application developers, a comprehensive list of over 5,500 application developers was created (see Exhibit D). The names and contact information of developers were obtained from public online sources (including, in some cases, websites that require subscription). Most

developers' names were obtained from three databases: CareerBuilder.com, Dice.com, and ZoomInfo.com. Other sources included LinkedIn.com, Monster.com, and Appindex.com.

Prospective respondents were randomly selected from the list.

19. As indicated, survey questions were designed to address the following issues:
 - a. Factors considered by application developers when deciding whether to develop applications for a mobile application platform.
 - b. Reasons for developing applications for the Android platform.
 - c. The developers' assessment of their ability to develop applications for a new platform that requires using a new and different programming language that they had not used before.
 - d. The relative importance of i) demand or user base of a mobile app platform and (ii) familiarity with the programming language used when developing applications for a mobile platform.
 - e. Focusing on behavioral measures, whether the developers learned the Objective-C language in order to develop iOS applications and whether they expect to learn the new Apple-created and -promoted Swift language for that purpose.

20. Although I am informed by counsel that Oracle is not contending that the Java programming language, as a whole, is protected by copyrights, and that the relevant copyrighted material accused by Oracle in the case is limited to the Accused APIs, out of an abundance of caution the questions in the survey sought information regarding the importance of programming languages (such as Java) to developers, rather than the importance of particular APIs within a given language (such as the Accused APIs here). I understand from counsel that, when developers learn a particular programming language, they also learn the APIs associated with that language, and that when a mobile platform adopts a given programming language, developers expect that the platform will also make use of at least some of the APIs associated with that language. In that sense, the results of the survey are

conservative and give Oracle the benefit of the doubt, because some of the value of programming languages to developers may exist in aspects of the language other than its associated APIs. Further, for purposes of a telephone survey, where a respondent's time is limited and easy comprehension of the questions being asked is critical, I concluded that it was preferable to ask respondents about programming languages (a larger, more inclusive category) rather than APIs (a narrower category that might have been susceptible to misinterpretation).

21. Some of the (open ended) questions asked respondents to list factors that influence or influenced their decisions concerning application development. Prior research indicates that, in most cases, the order in which decision factors are elicited corresponds to their relative importance. Indeed, the order of mention has been used as a measure of attribute importance.³ Furthermore, decision making research indicates that decisions are often determined by the most important factor or factors.⁴

22. The questionnaire was pretested (at the end of December) with 23 respondents in order to make sure that the questions were clear. Only a couple of minor changes were made based on the pretest, so the 23 initial interviews were included in the final sample. One change was the addition of a question (Question 11a; see Exhibit E2) that asked respondents whether they made decisions about which applications to develop independently or as part of a development team. In addition, the initial interviews suggested that some respondents misinterpreted Question 8 (Exhibit E1). Accordingly, the phrasing of the question was slightly revised (Question E2).

³ For a review of pertinent research and an empirical test, see for example, Itamar Simonson, Joel Huber, and John Payne (1988), "The Relationship Between Prior Brand Knowledge and Information Acquisition Order", *Journal of Consumer Research*, (March), 14,4, 566-78.

⁴ See, for example, Tversky, Amos; Sattath, Shmuel; Slovic, Paul (1988), "Contingent Valuation in Judgment and Choice," *Psychological Review*, Vol 95(3), Jul 1988, 371-384; Amos Tversky (1972), "Elimination by Aspects: A Theory of Choice," *Psychological Review*, 79, 281-299; Mark Albert (1971), "Identification of Determinant Attributes: A Comparison of Methods," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 8, 184-191.

23. The survey methodology followed the accepted standards regarding the manner in which questions are asked, proper filters are used, interviews are validated, and other aspects. With the assistance of Target Research Group, the phone survey was administered by experienced interviewers between December 28th, 2015, and January 22nd, 2016. The survey respondents as well as the phone research firm were “blind” to the purpose of the survey and the identity of its sponsor. Similarly, those who coded the respondents’ verbatim (open-ended) answers were “blind” to the purpose of the study and the identity of its sponsor. A complete (pre-programming) draft of the questionnaire is included in Exhibit E.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

Survey Universe

24. As indicated, the 152 application developers were phone-interviewed using the now standard Computer-Assisted-Telephone Interviewing (CATI) technique. Prospective respondents were first told:

“Hello, I’m _____ from Target Research Group, a nationwide market research organization. We’re conducting a very short survey with application developers, and we’d like to include your opinions. If you qualify and complete the survey, we will mail you \$25 to thank you for your cooperation. We are not selling anything; we are only interested in your opinions, which will be held in the strictest confidence.”

To qualify for survey participation, respondents had to meet the following screening criteria:

- a. They (or their firms) develop applications for smartphones and/or tablets.
- b. They are the persons who make or influence the decision whether to develop new applications.
- c. They develop applications for one or more of the following platforms:
 - i. Apple iPhones or iPads
 - ii. Android phones or tablets

- iii. Blackberry devices
- iv. Microsoft or Nokia phones or tablets
- d. They and other members of their household do not work for a market research firm, an advertising agency, or a public relations firm.

Main Questionnaire

25. At the beginning of the interview, respondents were given the following instruction:

“First, when answering the questions, if you don’t know the answer or don’t have an opinion, please don’t guess; just tell me you don’t know, and we’ll go on to the next question.”

The first question (after the screening phase) focused on the factors that respondents would consider when deciding whether to develop applications for a mobile device platform that first introduced two years earlier. Specifically, they were asked:

“Suppose a new platform for mobile devices, in addition to the existing platforms, was introduced two years ago. What factors or considerations will influence your decision today whether or not to develop applications for this platform first introduced two years ago?”

Respondents could identify up to eight factors. They were then asked to select the most important factor in their decision as well as the second most important factor; they also explained their reasoning regarding the two most important decision factors.

26. To further investigate the considerations that influence decisions to develop applications for a new platform, respondents were next asked:

“Suppose now you are approached by a promoter for a mobile device platform that has been around for a few years, but so far you have not developed any application for that platform.

What is the first thing you would want to know from the promoter about that platform before deciding if you'll develop applications for that platform?

What is the second thing you would want to know from the promoter about that platform before deciding if you'll develop applications for that platform?"

27. The next questions focused specifically on the respondents' decisions to begin developing applications for the Android platform (only the approximately three-quarters of the respondents who had indicated they developed Android applications were asked these questions). Respondents were first asked about the year in which they first developed Android apps:

"You mentioned earlier that you have developed applications for the Android phone or tablet platform. As best as you remember, what year did you start offering applications for the Android phone or tablet platform?"

28. Next, these respondents were asked about the factors that caused them to develop Android apps:

"As best as you remember, what factors or considerations led to your decision to develop applications for the Android phone or tablet platform? Any other factors or considerations that led to your decision to develop applications for the Android phone or tablet platform? "

Respondents could identify up to eight decision factors.

29. Respondents who had indicated that they developed applications for another platform were asked the same questions about their decisions concerning applications for that other platform. In most cases, the other platform was iOS.

30. The next question asked respondents to assess their capability to learn a new programming language for a new mobile platform that had recently become popular. To address the possibility that most respondents would claim that they could do anything, a second question was included in order to determine if respondents indiscriminately tend to make such unrealistic claims. Thus, the second question, which asked them about their ability

to develop and establish a new programming language, served as a benchmark; if respondents simply claim to be able to do anything (i.e., rate their capability as close to or equal to 10 out of 10), then the ratings provided in the second questions would be similar to those in the first question. While a certain level of “noise” is expected (e.g., a tendency to be overconfident), if most respondents carefully considered their capability to perform what they were asked about, we would expect to observe, on average, significantly higher ratings in the former question. Considering that there could be some order effect on ratings, the order of the two questions (i.e., the one about the ability to develop applications and the one about the ability to develop a platform) was counterbalanced across respondents, with an equal number of respondents randomly assigned to each order. In addition, each question had two (counterbalanced across respondents) versions, one that first mentioned the most negative extreme rating (0), and another that first mentioned the most positive extreme rating (10).

31. The question pertaining to the capability to develop applications for a new platform that required learning a different language was the following:

“Suppose a platform that was introduced a couple of years ago, has recently gained in popularity in terms of number of users. In a situation like that, how would you rate your capability to learn to develop applications for that platform assuming it requires using a new and different programming language that you have not used before?

The rating you give should be from 0, which means “Completely incapable of learning to develop applications for that platform” to 10, which means “Completely capable of learning to develop applications for that platform.”

After providing their rating, respondents were asked to explain it.

32. The question regarding establishing a new platform was the following:

“Please rate your capability to develop and establish a completely new programming language in the market for use in mobile applications that is different from all existing programming languages.

The rating you give should be from 0, which means “Completely incapable of developing

and establishing a new programming language for mobile applications that is different from all existing programming languages,” to 10 which means “Completely capable of developing and establishing a new programming language for use in mobile applications that is different from all existing programming languages.”.”

33. Next, respondents were asked to rate the importance of following six factors “when deciding to commit resources to developing applications for a particular mobile platform” (the order of the six factors was randomized):

- 1) The number of users or devices already using the platform;
- 2) Your prior familiarity with the programming language used by the platform;
- 3) The ease or difficulty of getting new applications approved for sale by the platform owner;
- 4) The percentage of revenue from purchases of the application retained by the platform owner;
- 5) The brand strength and marketing resources of the platform owner;
- 6) Whether the platform at issue is an open or closed ecosystem.

34. The final set of questions focused on behavioral measures pertaining to the respondents’ willingness to learn a new programming language to meet user demand. First, respondents who had earlier indicated they developed iOS applications were asked if they developed applications for iOS written in the Objective-C language; if they did, they were asked whether they had to learn Objective-C programming language in order to accomplish that purpose. Specifically, respondents were asked:

“Have you or your firm developed applications for iOS written in the Objective-C language?”

[IF YES] “Prior to developing applications for iOS, did you know the Objective-C programming language, did you have to learn it, or did you hire an experienced Objective-C developer to develop for iOS?”

35. Next, respondents were asked:

“Over the past two years, Apple has introduced and updated a new programming language called Swift. Do you or don’t you plan to learn Swift for your applications development work for iOS?”

36. Finally, respondents were asked:

“In general, do you make decisions about which applications to develop independently, or as part of a team of application developers?”

The response options included the following: (1) Independently, (2) As part of a team of application developers, and (3) Both, sometimes independently and sometimes as part of a team of application developers.

Analysis and Validation

37. As indicated, data collection was managed and supervised by Target Research Group, a highly experienced survey research firm. A validation survey was conducted by an independent research firm, Field Solutions (located in Florida). Field Solutions was able to reach 149 of the 152 respondents (98%), a validation rate that far exceeds industry and litigation survey standards. No discrepancies were discovered, and in all cases respondents confirmed their survey participation and qualifications for the survey. Accordingly, the final, tabulated results are based on all 152 respondents.

SUMMARY OF KEY SURVEY FINDINGS

38. The tabulated survey results are presented in Exhibit F. Exhibit G includes an Excel file that presents the coded answers of all respondents to all questions. The codebook, which can be used to identify the meaning of each verbal answer code in Exhibit G, is included in Exhibit H. Exhibit I presents the complete open-ended (verbal) responses of all respondents. In this section I will review some of the key findings and discuss their implications.

39. Respondents met all the screening criteria. About three-quarters of the respondents have developed applications for the Android platform, compared with 87% who

have developed applications for the iOS platform; only a small percentage of the respondents have developed for the other platforms (Blackberry and Microsoft/Nokia). In addition, the answers to Question 11a indicated that 22% of the respondents independently make decisions as to which applications they develop, 52% make such decisions as part of a team of developers, and 26% make some decisions independently and other decisions as part of a development team.

Factors and Considerations Affecting Decisions as to Whether to Develop Applications for a Recently Introduced Platform

40. As indicated, the order in which respondents mention their decision considerations tends to be a reliable indicator of their relative importance. Table 4 in Exhibit F shows the distribution of factors mentioned first as well as the factors mentioned subsequently. As the results indicate, by far (62%) the largest response category (referred to in the tables as a “Net”) of considerations mentioned first is “User base/ Market share/ Demand/ Popularity/ ROI.” Many individual verbal responses that fell under this broad category are included in Exhibits H and I. This result clearly shows that the primary factor that drives most decisions as to whether to develop applications for a new platform is the demand (or expected demand) and related economic considerations (such as ROI). That is, if there is an opportunity to reach many users, developers are evidently willing to make the necessary investment to address that market. Other factors such as familiarity with the language, if they are mentioned, tend to be less important, secondary considerations.

41. Only 19.7% of the respondents mentioned first any development issue. Within that general response category, less than 3% mentioned prior familiarity with the language as a consideration.

42. Table 6 (Exhibit F) summarizes all of the factors (i.e., not just the first) mentioned as considerations influencing decisions whether to develop applications for a recently introduced platform. Again, the “User base/ Market share/ Demand/ Popularity/ ROI”

response category is by far the largest (75%). Considerations related to any development factor account for 51% of all considerations (most of which were not mentioned first), including primarily considerations related to the development effort and the provided support. Only 6% of the respondents mentioned familiarity with the language as contributing to their decision in any respect.

43. Respondents were next asked to identify *the single most important* consideration (Table 7 in Exhibit F). Consistent with prior result that the first mentioned factor tends to be most important (Table 4), 62.5% of the respondents indicated as most important the “User base/ Market share/ Demand/ Popularity/ ROI.” Development related factors were mentioned as most important by 17.8%, with less than 3% mentioning familiarity with the programming language. When asked to explain their answers (Table 8), those who mentioned demand-related considerations as most important tended to provide answers pertaining, for example, to economic considerations (e.g., profit potential) and their goal of reaching a large user pool.

44. When asked about the second most important consideration, 28% mentioned a factor related to demand and 27% mentioned a factor related to development. Only about 1% of the respondents mentioned the programming language.

45. The next question examined the relative importance of decision considerations from a different angle, focusing on the questions that the respondents would ask a promoter of a new mobile platform. One might expect such questions directed to a platform promoter to focus on technical and support aspects. As shown in Tables 13 and 14 in Exhibit F, expected demand and number of users again represented the largest response category. However, development-related answers were more common than in the earlier questions. For example, questions pertaining to development support were mentioned by 26% of the respondents.

46. In conclusion, the survey questions pertaining to the factors that drive decisions regarding development of applications for a new platform show that expected demand and related economic considerations are the most important considerations of the great majority of

application developers. Evidently, these application developers are most interested in the size of the opportunity, with development issues being secondary in general, and the familiarity with the programming language playing a minimal, if any, role.

Factors that Led to the Decision to Develop Android Applications

47. Seventy-six percent of the respondents (116 of the 152 respondents) indicated that they develop Android applications. These respondents were asked when they first developed Android applications, and their answers ranged from 2007 and 2015, with the majority starting between 2010 and 2013 (Table 15).

48. These 116 respondents were next asked about the factors that contributed to their decision to develop Android applications. As shown in Table 16, the majority of the respondents (66 out of the 116 respondents, or 57%) mentioned as the first factor considerations related to “User base/ Market share/ Demand/ Popularity/ ROI.” Thus, for example, the user base and the growth potential of Android applications were primary decision drivers for many of the respondents. Development factors were mentioned by 23 respondents (20%). Prior familiarity or experience with Java was mentioned (as the first factor) in only seven responses (4.6%).

49. Respondents provided up to seven reasons for the decision to develop Android applications. Combining all reasons mentioned by respondents (Table 18), 69% of those who develop Android applications mentioned “User base/ Market share/ Demand/ Popularity/ ROI.” Development factors were mentioned by 41 respondents (41%). Prior familiarity or experience with Java was mentioned in 14 responses (9.2%). Thus, consistent with the answers to the earlier questions, the decision to develop Android applications was motivated primarily by the platform’s growth potential and user demand; by contrast, the provided explanations indicate that prior familiarity with Java played a minimal or no role in virtually all decisions to develop Android applications.

50. A total of 132 respondents (87% of all respondents) indicated that they developed iOS applications. By and large, the factors that led to their decision to develop iOS applications paralleled those for Android applications (see Tables 19-22), but there were some differences. The percentage of reasons referring to demand, market size, and growth potential was somewhat lower among iOS application developers (across all provided reasons, 75 of 132 respondents or 57%, compared to 69% for Android), whereas there were relatively more mentions of “the needs of the client” and “fits my interests.” As indicated, Java was mentioned by some Android app developers (12% when all reasons are combined), while almost no one (2%, which might reflect the “noise” level) mentioned Java when asked about iOS applications.

Developers’ Assessment of Their Ability to Develop Applications for a Platform that Requires Using a New and Different Programming Language

51. The results presented so far indicate that prior familiarity with a programming language plays a relatively small, if any, role in developers’ decisions whether to develop applications for a new mobile platform, including Android. After answering the questions about their decision criteria, respondents were asked about their assessment of their ability to develop applications that require using a different programming language that they had not previously used. Specifically, they were asked the following question:

“Suppose a platform that was introduced a couple of years ago, has recently gained in popularity in terms of number of users. In a situation like that, how would you rate your capability to learn to develop applications for that platform assuming it requires using a new and different programming language that you have not used before?

The rating you give should be from 0, which means “Completely incapable of learning to develop applications for that platform” to 10, which means “Completely capable of learning to develop applications for that platform.””

52. When designing this question, I had two concerns: (a) respondents may not fully understand the question, and (b) respondents may tend to “brag” and claim to be able to do

anything they are asked about. The first concern can be addressed by examining the explanations provided by respondents for their answers. The second concern was addressed by adding another question (discussed next) that asked about the ability of respondents to develop and establish a new mobile platform. Although some respondents might be able to try to do that (perhaps as part of a large team of developers), it was expected that most applications developers would recognize that establishing a new programming language was a task requiring a much larger scale investment of time and money than simply developing an application, and enter a lower rating in this question. If the latter question did in fact produce lower ratings, then we could conclude that respondents were not simply bragging and claiming to do things that they could not do.

53. The results pertaining to the question reproduced above are presented in Table 30. As the results show, 70% of the respondents rated their capability to develop applications that require using a new programming language between 8 and 10, which indicates great confidence that they could do that (given the assumption that the platform is popular). The median rating was 8.5 with a mean rating of 8.2.

54. They were next asked to explain the ratings (Table 31). By far the largest response category was “I am experienced and can learn how to do it.” This finding, consistent with the answers to earlier questions, indicates that application developers are driven primarily by the demand, user base, and profitability considerations; by contrast, the effort associated with development issues generally (and with learning a new programming language in particular) plays a minimal role, and appears to present little, if any, impediment to a developer’s willingness and ability to put in the time and effort required to develop applications for a viable new mobile platform presenting a good market opportunity.

55. As indicated, respondents were asked a benchmark question to test whether they were inclined to claim they “could do anything,” including developing and establishing a new programming language (the order of the two questions pertaining to the respondents’

capability to develop applications and to develop a platform was counterbalanced; the order of the response options was also counterbalanced).

56. The results confirmed that respondents' ratings were sensitive and responsive to the differences between the two questions they were asked (see tables 34-35). The median rating in the benchmark question was 4.6 (compared to 8.5), with a mean of 5.0 (the difference between the mean ratings in the two questions is statistically significant at the standard 95% confidence level). Furthermore, whereas 70% entered a rating between 8 and 10 regarding the ability to develop applications that require learning a new language, only 25% entered 8-10 ratings regarding their ability to develop a new programming language (and the explanations of many of these 25% of the respondents suggested that many of them misinterpreted the question). These results show that respondents' ratings of their ability to develop applications that require learning a new language reflected their real assessments that they were highly capable of doing that, rather than just an indiscriminant tendency to brag.

The Relative Important of Factors Influencing Application Development Decisions

57. Respondents were next asked to rate (again using a 0-10 scale) the importance of six factors (evaluated in random order) influencing decisions to invest resources to develop applications. Although focusing on one factor at a time tends in many cases to inflate the importance of factors (consistent with the phenomenon of "focalism bias" that is also known as the "impact bias"), a comparison of the factor ratings inform us about their relative decision importance. The following results for each of the six factors are presented in Table 38 (Exhibit F):

- a. The number of users or devices already using the platform: Median = 8.7; Mean = 8.6.
- b. Your prior familiarity with the programming language used by the platform: Median = 6.5; Mean = 6.7.
- c. The ease or difficulty of getting new applications approved for sale by the platform owner: Median = 7.1; Mean = 7.1.

- d. The percentage of revenue from purchases of the application retained by the platform owner: Median = 7.3; Mean = 7.3.
- e. The brand strength and marketing resources of the platform owner: Median = 7.4; Mean = 7.5.
- f. Whether the platform at issue is an open or closed ecosystem: Median = 5.7; Mean = 6.0.

58. First, we can examine the relative importance of the six factors. As can be seen, “The number of users or devices already using the platform” is by far the most important decision factor. To reach statistical significance in this case (at the standard 95% confidence level), a difference between mean ratings should be approximately 0.7 or greater. As can be seen, this factor is significantly more important than all other factors. By contrast, “Your prior familiarity with the programming language used by the platform” is the second least important of the six factors. The only factor that had a lower (not significantly) mean rating was “Whether the platform at issue is an open or closed ecosystem.” It is not surprising that this last factor would have the lowest rating, given that the two leading mobile platforms in the U.S. market are Android, which is an open platform, and iOS, which has historically been a closed system over which Apple exercises substantial control. As noted earlier, many applications developers who participated in the survey developed applications for both Android and iOS.

59. These results are consistent with the earlier findings. Specifically, prior familiarity with the programming language used by the platform is not an important factor influencing developers’ decisions as to whether they will develop applications for a mobile platform.

An Assessment of the (Un)importance of Prior Familiarity with Programming Language Based on Behavioral Evidence

60. The results presented so far show in a number of ways that prior familiarity with a programming language is not a significant factor influencing app developers’ decisions

whether to commit resources to a new mobile platform, and is not an impediment to developers' willingness and ability to develop applications for a mobile platform presenting a potentially attractive commercial opportunity. Put another way, if a mobile platform demonstrates significant demand and a growing number of users (the dominant decision factor as revealed by this survey), there is no reason to believe any significant number of developers, if any at all, would refuse to develop applications for that platform based on unfamiliarity with the programming language. To further explore this conclusion, it is useful to examine behavioral measures pertaining to the developers' decisions to commit resources to a platform despite the need to learn a new programming language. The final survey questions were designed for that purpose.

61. Respondents who had indicated that they developed iOS applications and then said that they developed applications for iOS that were written in the Objective-C language (110 respondents; see Table 40) were next asked if they had to learn the language to develop applications. Of the 110 qualified respondents, 79 (72%) indicated that they had to learn the Objective-C language. This finding provides a behavioral measure of the willingness of developers to learn a programming language in order to be able to develop applications for a popular mobile platform, and suggests that developers would have developed applications for Android once Android demonstrated its commercial viability, regardless of their familiarity with the Java language or the Accused APIs.

62. Respondents were next asked if they intend to learn the Swift language introduced by Apple two years ago. Of the 110 respondents who were asked the question, 89 respondents (81%) said that they do. Again, this result shows the willingness of developers to learn a programming language in order to be able to develop applications for the relevant platform.

63. In conclusion, using a number of different measures, the survey results show that the demand for applications is by far the most important driver of decisions whether to develop applications for a mobile platform. By contrast, prior familiarity with a programming

language, including Java, plays a minor, if any, role in developers' decisions whether to cater to users of a mobile platform. The survey results further suggest that, for a developer considering whether to begin developing applications for a newer mobile platform that has demonstrated demand for applications and a large or growing user base, it would not be a significant consideration, much less an important one, that the mobile platform used a programming language the developer did not know or had not used.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE PERTAINING TO THE IMPORTANCE OF USER DEMAND IN DEVELOPERS'
DECISIONS TO DEVELOP ANDROID APPLICATIONS

64. As detailed in Exhibit C, I reviewed a number of documents, including documents pertaining to the marketing and market response to the Android platform as well as empirical market research studies evaluating and discussing the preferences and behavior of actual applications developers. Without reviewing these documents in detail in this report, it is instructive to find out whether these other information sources are consistent with the results of my survey. Here I provide one illustrative example.

65. A 2012 study conducted by the research firm IDC (see IDC Appcelerator Q3 2012, Mobile Developer survey report (page 9)), reached the following conclusion: "Platforms with large install base win over developers." This headline is followed by the following:

First criterion for choosing a platform: Large installed base of devices

Second criterion: Low cost of devices

Third: Revenue potential."

None of the three criteria identified by this report as important to applications developers involve the developers' prior use or familiarity with a programming language or associated APIs.

Date: 2/8/2016

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "I. Simonson", written over a horizontal line.

Itamar Simonson, Ph.D.

Itamar Simonson

ADDRESSES

January 2016

Home:

1561 Newlands Ave.
Burlingame, CA 94010
(650) 343-3320

Cell: (650) 387-7677

itamar.simonson@gmail.com

Office:

Graduate School of Business
655 Knight Center, Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-5015
(650) 725-8981
itamars@stanford.edu

EDUCATION

Ph.D.

Duke University, Fuqua School of Business
Major: Marketing; May 1987

M.B.A.

UCLA, Graduate School of Management
Major: Marketing; March 1978

B.A.

Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel
Major: Economics, Political Science; August 1976

ACADEMIC POSITIONS

July 1987 - June 1993 University of California, Berkeley
Haas School of Business
Assistant Professor

July 1993 – Aug. 1996 Stanford Graduate School of Business
Associate Professor of Marketing

Sept. 1996 – Aug. 1999 Stanford Graduate School of Business
Professor of Marketing

Sept. 1999 – Present Stanford Graduate School of Business
Sebastian S. Kresge Professor of Marketing

1994 – 2000 Stanford Graduate School of Business
Marketing Group Head

2000, 2004, 2012 Visiting Professor of Marketing: MIT; NYU; Columbia

AWARDS

- Best Article in the *Journal of Consumer Research* during the period 1987-1989.
- The 1997 O'Dell Award (for the *Journal of Marketing Research* article that has had the greatest impact on the marketing field in the previous five years).
- The 2001 O'Dell Award.
- Honorary Doctorate: University of Paris II – Sorbonne Universities.
- Elected Fellow of the Association for Consumer Research.
- The 2007 Society for Consumer Psychology Distinguished Scientific Achievement Award.
- Finalist for the O'Dell Award: 1995; 2002; 2004; 2005; 2007; 2008; 2012.
- Best Article in the *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* during the period 1993-1995.
- The 2002 American Marketing Association Award for the Best Article on Services Marketing.
- The Association for Consumer Research 1990 "Ferber Award."
- Finalist for the 2003 Paul Green Award (for the *Journal of Marketing Research* article with the greatest potential to contribute to the practice of marketing research).
- Runner-up for the 2005 *Journal of Consumer Research* Best Article Award.
- Winner in the Marketing Science Institute and Direct Marketing Association competition on "Understanding and Measuring the Effect of Direct Marketing."
- Runner-up for the 1993 *California Management Review* Best Article Award.
- National Science Foundation Grant (for 1996-8).
- Outstanding Reviewer Award, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2005, 2009.
- Honorable Mention for the Sloan Executive Program Teaching Award.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Stanford University:

Marketing Management (for MBAs and the Sloan Executive Program)
Marketing to Businesses (for MBAs); Technology Marketing (for MBAs)
Critical Analytical Thinking (for MBAs)
Research Methods for Studying Consumer Behavior (a Ph.D. Course)
Decision Making (a Ph.D. Course)
Consumer Behavior (a Ph.D. course)

University Of California, Berkeley:

MBA, Ph.D. and Executive Education Classes on Marketing Management and Consumer Behavior.

BUSINESS EXPERIENCE

October 1978-August 1983 Motorola, Inc.

Worked in an international subsidiary; responsibilities included marketing research and customer analysis, definition of new products, pricing, analysis of sales force performance, competitive intelligence, and forecasting. Conducted studies of markets for various communications products. Last two years served as Product Marketing Manager for communications products.

Consulting:

Consulted for clients from a wide range of industries such as technology, communications, services, and manufacturing sectors.

Expert witness assignments: trademark infringement, deceptive advertising, surveys, consumer behavior, marketing management, branding, retailing, distribution, assessment of demand drivers and feature value, and other marketing issues.

PUBLICATIONS

Itamar Simonson (2016), "Imperfect Progress: An Objective, Quality Assessment of the Role of User Reviews in Consumer Decision Making," *Journal of Consumer Research*, Forthcoming.

Leilei Gao and Itamar Simonson (2016), "The Positive Effect of Assortment Size on Purchase Likelihood: The Moderating Influence of Decision Order," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Forthcoming.

Itamar Simonson (2015), "Mission (Largely) Accomplished: What's Next for Consumer BDT-JDM Researchers?" *Journal of Marketing Behavior*, 1, 9-35.

Itamar Simonson (2015), "The BDT Effect and Future: A Reply to John Lynch and Norbert Schwarz" *Journal of Marketing Behavior*, 1, 59-73.

Itamar Simonson (2014), "Vices and Virtues of Misguided Replications: The Case of Asymmetric Dominance," *Journal of Marketing Research*; 51 (4), 514-9.

Itamar Simonson and Emanuel Rosen (2014), *Absolute Value: What Really Influences Customers in the Age of (Nearly) Perfect Information*, HarperCollins Publishers.

Itamar Simonson and Emanuel Rosen (2014), "What Marketers Misunderstand About Online Reviews," *Harvard Business Review*, January, 23-5.

(HBR Blog: "Three Long-Held Concepts Every Marketer Should Rethink," January 22, 2014)

Leilei Gao, YanLiu Huang, and Itamar Simonson (2014), "The Influence of Initial Possession Level on Consumers' Adoption of A Collection Goal: A Tipping Point Effect," *Journal of Marketing*, 78, 143-156.

Aner Sela, Itamar Simonson, and Ran Kivetz (2013), "Beating the Market: The Allure of Unintended Value," *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. L (December), 691-705.

- Itamar Simonson, James Bettman, Thomas Kramer, and John Payne (2013), "Comparison Selection: An Approach to the Study of Consumer Judgment and Choice," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 23(1), 137-149.
- Itamar Simonson, James Bettman, Thomas Kramer, and John Payne (2013), "Directions for Judgment and Decision Making Research Based on Comparison Selection: Reply to Arkes, Johnson, and Kardes," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 23(1), 161-3.
- Itamar Simonson and Ran Kivetz (2012), "Demand Effects in Likelihood of Confusion Surveys: The Importance of Marketplace Conditions," Ch. 11 in *Trademark and False Advertising Surveys*, Edited by Shari Diamond and Jerre Swann, American Bar Association.
- Thomas Kramer, Michal Maimaran, and Itamar Simonson (2012), "Asymmetric Option Effects on Ease of Choice Criticism and Defense," *OBHDP*, 117, 179-91.
- Michal Maimaran and Itamar Simonson (2011), "Multiple Routes to Self Versus Other-Expression in Consumer Choice," *Journal of Marketing Research*, August, 755-66.
- Itamar Simonson and Aner Sela (2011), "On the Heritability of Consumer Decision Making: An Exploratory Approach for Studying Genetic Effects on Judgment and Choice," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37, 951-66.
- Stephen Nowlis, Ravi Dhar, and Itamar Simonson (2010), "The Effect of Decision Order on Purchase Quantity Decisions," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 40 (4), 725-737.
- Chezy Ofir, Itamar Simonson, and Song-Oh Yoon (2009), "The Robustness of the Effects of Consumers' Participation in Market Research: The Case of Service Quality Evaluations," *Journal of Marketing*, 73 (November), 105-14.
- Aimee Drolet, Mary Frances Luce, and Itamar Simonson (2009), "When Does Choice Reveal Preference? Moderators of Heuristic vs. Goal Based Choice," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36 (1).
- Itamar Simonson (2008), "Regarding Inherent Preferences," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 18, 191-196.
- Itamar Simonson (2008), "Will I Like a 'Medium' Pillow? Another Look at Constructed and Inherent Preferences," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 18, 155-169.
- Song-Oh Yoon and Itamar Simonson (2008), "The Context of Construction as a Determinant of the Strength and Stability of Consumer Preferences," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35, September, 324-336.
- Itamar Simonson (2007), "Decision Making," *Encyclopedia of Social Psychology*; Sage.
- Jonah Berger, Michaela Draganska, and Itamar Simonson (2007), "The Influence of Product Variety on Brand Perceptions, Choice, and Experience," *Marketing Science*, 26, July-August, 460-72.
- Nathan Novemsky, Ravi Dhar, Norbert Schwarz, and Itamar Simonson (2007), "Preference Fluency in Choice," *Journal of Marketing Research*, XLIV, 347-356.
- Chezy Ofir and Itamar Simonson (2007), "The Effect of Stating Expectations on Customer Satisfaction and Shopping Experience," *Journal of Marketing Research*, February, 164-174.

- Ray Fisman, Sheena Iyengar, Emir Kamenica, and Itamar Simonson (2007), "Racial Preferences in Dating," *Review of Economic Studies*, 75, 1, 117-132.
- Raymond Fisman, Sheena Iyengar, Emir Kamenica, and Itamar Simonson (2006), "Gender Differences in Mate Selection: Evidence from a Speed Dating Experiment," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 121 (2), 673-697.
- Itamar Simonson (2005), "Determinants of Customers' Responses to Customized Offers: Conceptual Framework and Research Propositions," *Journal of Marketing*, 69 (January), 32-45.
- Itamar Simonson (2005), "In Defense of Consciousness: The Role of Conscious and Unconscious Inputs in Consumer Choice," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 15(3), 211-217.
- Donnel Briley, Michael Morris, and Itamar Simonson (2005), "Cultural Chameleons: Biculturals, Conformity Motives, and Decision Making," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 15 (4), 351-362.
- Uptal Dholakia and Itamar Simonson (2005), "The Effect of Explicit Reference Points on Consumer Choice and Online Bidding Behavior," *Marketing Science*, 24, 206-17.
- Itamar Simonson, Thomas Kramer, and Maia Young (2004), "Effect Propensity," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 95 (November), 156-74.
- Itamar Simonson and Aimee Drolet (2004), "Anchoring Effects on Consumers' Willingness-to-Pay and Willingness-to-Accept," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31 (December), 681-90.
- Ran Kivetz and Itamar Simonson (2003) "The Idiosyncratic Fit Heuristic: The Role of Effort Advantage in Consumer Response to Loyalty Programs," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 40 (November), 454-67.
- Dan Ariely and Itamar Simonson (2003), "Buying, Bidding, Playing, or Competing? Value Assessment and Decision Dynamics in Online Auctions," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 13(1&2), 113-123.
- Ravi Dhar and Itamar Simonson (2003), "The Effect of Forced Choice on Choice," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 40 (May), 146-60.
- Ran Kivetz and Itamar Simonson (2002), "Self Control for the Righteous: Toward a Theory of Luxury Pre-Commitment," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29 (September), 199-217.
- Ran Kivetz and Itamar Simonson (2002), "Earning the Right to Indulge: Effort as a Determinant of Customer Preferences Toward Frequency Program Rewards," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 39 (May), 155-70.
- Chezy Ofir and Itamar Simonson (2001), "In Search of Negative Customer Feedback: The Effect of Expecting to Evaluate on Satisfaction Evaluations," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38 (May), 170-82.
- Itamar Simonson, Ziv Carmon, Ravi Dhar, Aimee Drolet, and Stephen Nowlis (2001), "Consumer Research: In Search of Identity," *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 249-275.
- Donnel Briley, Michael Morris, and Itamar Simonson (2000), "Reasons as Carriers of Culture: Dynamic Vs. Dispositional Models of Cultural Influence on Decision Making," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27 (September), 157-178.

- Aimee Drolet, Itamar Simonson, and Amos Tversky (2000), "Indifference Curves that Travel with the Choice Set," *Marketing Letters*, 11(3), 199-209.
- Stephen Nowlis and Itamar Simonson (2000), "Sales promotions and the Choice Context as Competing Influences on Consumer Decision Making," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 9(1), 1-17.
- Ran Kivetz and Itamar Simonson (2000), "The Effect of Incomplete Information on Consumer Choice," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 37(4), 427-48.
- Itamar Simonson and Stephen Nowlis (2000), "The Effect of Explaining and Need for Uniqueness on Consumer Decision Making: Unconventional Consumer Choices Based on Reasons," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27 (June), 49-68.
- Itamar Simonson (1999), "The Effect of Product Assortment on Consumer Preferences," *Journal of Retailing*, 75(3), 347-70.
- Ravi Dhar and Itamar Simonson (1999), "Making Complementary Choices in Consumption Episodes: Highlighting Versus Balancing" *Journal of Marketing Research*, 36 (February), 29-44.
- Houghton, David, ..., and Itamar Simonson (1999), "Correction Processes in Consumer Choice," *Marketing Letters*, 10(2), 107-112.
- Ziv Carmon and Itamar Simonson (1998), "Price-Quality Tradeoffs in Choice Versus Matching: New Insights into the Prominence Effect," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 7(4), 323-343.
- Stephen Nowlis and Itamar Simonson (1997), "Attribute-Task Compatibility as a Determinant of Consumer Preference Reversals," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34 (May), 205-218.
- Joel Huber, ..., and Itamar Simonson (1997), "Thinking About Values in Prospect and Retrospect: Maximizing Experienced Utility," *Marketing Letters*, 7, 324-334.
- Stephen Nowlis and Itamar Simonson (1996), "The Impact of New Product Features on Brand Choice," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 33 (February), 36-46.
- Itamar Simonson (1994), "Trademark Infringement from the Buyer Perspective: Conceptual Analysis and Measurement Implications," *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 13(2), 181-199.
- Itamar Simonson (1994), "An Empirical Investigation of the Meaning and Measurement of Genericness," *Trademark Reporter*, 84 (2), 199-223.
- Itamar Simonson, Ziv Carmon, and Suzanne O'Curry (1994), "Experimental Evidence on the Negative Effect of Product Features and Sales Promotions on Brand Choice," *Marketing Science*, 13 (1), 23-40.
- Itamar Simonson (1993), "Get Closer to Your Customers by Understanding How They Make Choices," *California Management Review*, 35 (4), 68-84.
- Itamar Simonson (1993), "The Effect of Survey Method on Likelihood of Confusion Estimates: Conceptual Analysis and Empirical Test," *Trademark Reporter*, 83 (3), 364-393.
- Itamar Simonson, Stephen Nowlis, and Katherine Lemon (1993), "The Effect of Local Consideration Sets on Global Choice Between Lower Price and Higher Quality," *Marketing Science*, 12 (4), 357-377.

- Itamar Simonson, Stephen Nowlis, and Yael Simonson (1993), "The Effect of Irrelevant Preference Arguments on Consumer Choice," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 2 (3), 287-306.
- Eldar Shafir, Itamar Simonson, and Amos Tversky (1993), "Reasons-Based Choice," *Cognition*, 49, 11-36.
- Amos Tversky and Itamar Simonson (1993), "Context-Dependent Preferences," *Management Science*, 39 (10), 1179-1189.
- Itamar Simonson (1992), "Influences of Anticipating Regret and Responsibility on Purchase Decisions," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19 (June), 105-118.
- Itamar Simonson and Peter Nye (1992), "The Effect of Accountability on Susceptibility to Decision Errors", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 51 (3), 416-446.
- Itamar Simonson and Amos Tversky (1992), "Choice in Context: Tradeoff Contrast and Extremeness Aversion," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 29 (August), 281-295.
- Itamar Simonson and Barry Staw (1992), "De-Escalation Strategies: A Comparison of Techniques for Reducing Commitment to Losing Courses of Action," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77 (4), 419-426.
- Itamar Simonson and Russell S. Winer (1992), "The Influence of Purchase Quantity and Display Format on Consumer Preference for Variety," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19 (June), 133-138.
- Ravi Dhar and Itamar Simonson (1992), "The Effect of the Focus of Comparison on Consumer Preferences," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 29 (November), 430-440.
- William T. Ross and Itamar Simonson (1991), "Evaluations of Pairs of Experiences: A Preference for Happy Endings," *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 4(4), 273-282.
- Itamar Simonson (1991), "The Effect of Buying Decisions on Consumers' Assessments of Their Tastes", *Marketing Letters*, 2, 1, 5-14.
- Itamar Simonson (1990), "The Effect of Purchase Quantity and Timing on Variety Seeking Behavior," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 27 (May), 150-162.
- Itamar Simonson (1989), "Choice Based on Reasons: The Case of Attraction and Compromise Effects," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16 (September), 158-174.
- Itamar Simonson, Joel Huber, and John Payne (1988), "The Relationship Between Prior Brand Knowledge and Information Acquisition Order", *Journal of Consumer Research*, (March), 14,4, 566-78.

ARTICLES UNDER REVIEW

- Aimee Drolet, Aner Sela, and Itamar Simonson (2015), "Construction Disposition: The Case of Compromising."
- Haiyang Yang, Ziv Carmon, and Itamar Simonson, "The Preference for Practical Knowledge: Its Conceptualization, Measurement, and Ability to Predict Consumer Behaviors."

Wendy Liu and Itamar Simonson, "Jeopardy! Understanding the Beat-the-Incumbent Choice Process."

Ioannis Evangelidis, Jonathan Levav, and Itamar Simonson "Comparison Focus: The Asymmetric Impact of Context Effects on Advantaged versus Disadvantaged Options."

Doctoral Dissertations Chaired:

Ravi Dhar (Chaired Professor, Yale U.)

Aimee Drolet (Chaired Professor, UCLA)

Stephen Nowlis (Chaired Professor, Washington U., St. Louis)

Ziv Carmon (Chaired Professor, INSEAD)

Ran Kivetz (Chaired Professor, Columbia U.)

Donnel Briley (Professor, U.O. Sydney)

Thomas Kramer (Tenured Associate Professor, U.O. South Carolina)

Wendy Liu (Tenured Associate Professor, U.O. Calif., San Diego)

Sanjay Sood (Tenured Professor, UCLA)

Song-Oh Yoon (Assistant Professor, Korea U.)

Michal Maimaran (Clinical Assistant Professor, Kellogg School)

Leilei Gao (Assistant Professor, Chinese University, Hong Kong)

Aner Sela (Assistant Professor, U. O. Florida)

Jonah Berger (Tenured Associate Professor, Wharton School, U.O. Penn.)

EDITORIAL ACTIVITIES

Editorial Boards: *Journal of Marketing Research, Journal of Consumer Psychology, Journal of Marketing, Journal of Consumer Research, Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, International Journal of Research in Marketing, Journal of Marketing in Emerging Economies, Marketing Letters, Journal of Academy of Marketing Science, Review of Marketing Research.*

Reviewer for *Marketing Science, Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization, Science, Management Science, Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, Journal of Marketing, Journal of Retailing, Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, Journal of Experimental Psychology, Psychological Review, Psychological Bulletin, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Psychological Science, California Management Review, Journal of Economic Psychology, European Journal of Social Psychology, Journal of Judgment and Decision Making, Medical Decision Making*, and National Science Foundation.

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

Association for Consumer Research
Judgment and Decision Making Society
American Psychological Society

EXHIBIT B

Cases in which Dr. Itamar Simonson Testified as an Expert at Trial (including written expert reports submitted to the court) or by Deposition in the Past Four Years

1. Mobilemedia Ideas v. Research in Motion Limited (Nor. Dist. of TX; Dallas Div.; 3:11-CV-2353-N) (deposition)
2. Gucci America, Inc. v. Guess?, Inc. (S.D.N.Y.; 09-cv-4373).
3. Car Freshner v. Exotica Fresheners (SDNY; 14-CV-391) (Trial)
4. Romag Fasteners, Inc. v. Fossil Inc. et al. (Dist. of Conn.; 3: 10CV1827) (deposition).
5. Laura McCabe et al. v. Six Continents Hotels, Inc. (No. Dist. of CA, SF Div., 12-cv-04818 NC) (deposition).
6. GeoTag, Inc. v. AT&T et al. (Nor. Dist. of Texas, Dallas Div.; 2:10-CV-570) (deposition)
7. POM Wonderful LLC Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation (Cent. Dist. of CA; 2:10-ml 2199-DDP) (deposition)
8. Poquito Mas Licensing Corp. v. Taco Bell Corp. (Cent. Dist. of CA; 8:13-CV-01933) (deposition)
9. Whirlpool Corp. Front-Loading Washer Products Liability Litigation (Nor. Dist. Ohio; 1:08-wp-65000; MDL 2001) (trial)
10. Playtex Products, LLC v. Munchkin, Inc. (Cent. Dist. CA; CASE NO. CV 11-0503 AHM (RZX) (trial)
11. Tria Beauty, Inc. v. Radiancy, Inc. (No. Dist. of CA, SF Div.; C 10-5030 RS).
12. (on behalf of Sound Exchange) In the Matter of Determination of Rates and Terms for Preexisting Subscription Services and Satellite Digital Audio Radio Services (United States Copyright Judges, Washington, D.C., trial).
13. Timelines, Inc. v. Facebook, Inc. (No. Dist. of IL., 11 CV 6867) (deposition)
14. SRI International, Inc. v. Cisco Systems, Inc. (US Dist. of Del., 13-1534) (deposition)
15. Under Armour, Inc. v. Body Armor Nutrition (Dist. of MD, Baltimore Div.; 1:12-01283-JKB) (deposition).
16. Fage Dairy Processing Industry, S.A. v. General Mills, Inc. (Nort. Dist. of NY; 6:11-cv-01174) (deposition)
17. Fox Broadcasting Company et al. v. Dish Network (Cent. Dist. of CA; 12-04529) (deposition)

18. Skye Astiana et al. v. Kashi Company (South. dist. of CA; 11-CV-1967-HBGS) (deposition)
19. Bank of America v. Trilegiant Corp. & Affinion Group (Arbitration, Reference # 01-14-0000-4517) (Arbitration testimony)
20. Larry Butler et al. v. Sears, Roebuck and Co. (Nor. Dist. of IL, Eastern Div., 06-CV-7-23) (deposition)
21. Edward Tovey v. Nike, Inc. (Nor. Dist. of Ohio; 1:12 CV 448) (deposition)
22. RPI v. Apple Inc. (No. Dist. of NY, Albany Div.; 1:13-CV-633) (deposition)
23. WNET, ABC et al. (Broadcast networks) v. Aereo, Inc. (SDNY; 12-cv-1540)
24. Prism Technologies v. AT&T Mobility (Dist. of Nebraska; 8:12CV122) (deposition)
25. Western Sugar Cooperative et al. v. Archer-Daniels-Midland Company et al. (Cent. Dist. of CA, CV11-3473-CBM) (Trial)
26. TrueCar, Inc. v. Sonic Automotive, Inc. (Cent. Dist. of CA, West. Div.; 13-cv-05812) (deposition).
27. Lights Out Holdings and Shawne Merriman v. Nike, Inc. (South. Dist. Of CA, 3:14-cv- 00872-JAH-NLS) (deposition)
28. Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V. v. Hunt Control Systems (Dist. of NJ, 11-03684) (deposition).
29. PB Property Management, Inc., et al. v. Goodman Global (Middle Dist. of FL; 3:12-CV-1366-HES-JBT) and Anne McVicar et al., v. Goodman Global (Cent. Dist. of CA; 8:13-cv-13-01223-DOC-RNB) (deposition)
30. Exxon Mobil Corp. v. FX Networks et al. (South. Dist. of TX; 4:13– CV–02906) (deposition)
31. VIP Products v. Jack Daniel’s Properties (US Dist. of Ariz., CV 14-02057) (deposition).

DESCRIPTION
Amended Complaint for Patent and Copyright Infringement, Doc No. 1202 dated 10/27/2010
Order re Copyrightability of Certain Replicated Elements of the Java Application Programming Interface, Doc No. 1202, 5/31/2012
Google's Notice of Motion and Motion to Strike Portions of Third Expert Report by Iain Cockburn and Expert Report by Steven Shugan; Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support Thereof, Doc. No 718, 2/17/2012
Oracle America, Inc.'s Opposition to Google's Motion to Strike Portions of Third Expert Report by Iain Cockburn and Expert Report by Steven Shugan, Doc No. 737, 2/24/2012
Google's Reply in Support of Motion to Strike Portions of Third Expert Report by Iain Cockburn and Expert Report by Steven Shugan, Doc No. 751, 2/28/2012
Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Google's Daubert Motion to Exclude Dr. Cockburn's Third Report, Doc No. 785, 3/13/2012
Plaintiff Oracle America Proposed Supplemental Complaint
Deposition of Timothy Bray, November 30, 2011
All Transcript of Jury Trial Proceedings
GOOG-00000420
GOOG-00000513
GOOGLE-01-00019527
GOOGLE-01-00025575
GOOGLE-01-00029331
GOOGLE-02-00111218
GOOGLE-14-0042243
GOOG-10002147
GOOG-00022382
Number of Google Play Store apps 2015 available at http://www.statista.com/statistics/266210/number-of-available-applications-in-the-google-play-store/
Android development is 30% more expensive than iOS. And we have the numbers to prove it! available at https://infinum.co/the-capsized-eight/articles/android-development-is-30-percent-more-expensive-than-ios
App developers give brutally honest answers about why they pick iOS over Android available at http://bgr.com/2015/12/18/ios-vs-android-app-developers/
Google Play available at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Google_Play
Google Scholar available at http://scholar.google.com
Voice of the Next-Generation Mobile Developer available at http://www.appcelerator.com.s3.amazonaws.com/pdf/Appcelerator-Report-Q3-2012-final.pdf
Q3 2014 Mobile Trends Report available on www.appcelerator.com

S. Seggie and D. Griffith (2009), "What does it take to get promoted in marketing academia? Understanding exceptional publication productivity in the leading marketing journals," Journal of Marketing, 73

Itamar Simonson, Joel Huber, and John Payne (1988), "The Relationship Between Prior Brand Knowledge and Information Acquisition Order", Journal of Consumer Research, (March), 14,4

Tversky, Amos; Sattath, Shmuel; Slovic, Paul (1988),"Contingent Valuation in Judgment and Choice," Psychological Review, Vol 95(3), Jul 1988

Amos Tversky (1972), "Elimination by Aspects: A Theory of Choice," Psychological Review, 79

Mark Albert (1971), "Identification of Determinant Attributes: A Comparison of Methods," Journal of Marketing Research, 8

Applications developer contact information

EXHIBIT D

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
KAREN G. JOHNSON-MCKEWAN (SBN 121570)
kjohnson-mckewan@orrick.com
ANNETTE L. HURST (SBN 148738)
ahurst@orrick.com
GABRIEL M. RAMSEY (SBN 209218)
gramsey@orrick.com
405 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 1.415.773.5700 / Fax: 1.415.773.5759
PETER A. BICKS (*pro hac vice*)
pbicks@orrick.com
LISA T. SIMPSON (*pro hac vice*)
lsimpson@orrick.com
51 West 52nd Street, New York, NY 10019
Tel: 1.212.506.5000 / Fax: 1.212.506.5151

BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
DAVID BOIES (*pro hac vice*)
dboies@bsflp.com
333 Main Street, Armonk, NY 10504
Tel: 1.914.749.8200 / Fax: 1.914.749.8300
STEVEN C. HOLTZMAN (SBN 144177)
sholtzman@bsflp.com
1999 Harrison St., Ste. 900, Oakland, CA 94612
Tel: 1.510.874.1000 / Fax: 1.510.874.1460

ORACLE CORPORATION
DORIAN DALEY (SBN 129049)
dorian.daley@oracle.com
DEBORAH K. MILLER (SBN 95527)
deborah.miller@oracle.com
MATTHEW M. SARBORARIA (SBN 211600)
matthew.sarboraria@oracle.com
RUCHIKA AGRAWAL (SBN 246058)
ruchika.agrawal@oracle.com
500 Oracle Parkway,
Redwood City, CA 94065
Tel: 650.506.5200 / Fax: 650.506.7117

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ORACLE AMERICA, INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.
Plaintiff,
v.
GOOGLE INC.
Defendant.

Case No. CV 10-03561 WHA
**EXHIBITS D, G, AND I TO EXHIBIT 9
TO THE DECLARATION OF
ANDREW D. SILVERMAN**

Hearing: April 27, 2016, 8:00 a.m.
Dept.: Courtroom 8, 19th Floor
Judge: Honorable William H. Alsup

MANUAL FILING NOTIFICATION

Regarding: Manually Filed Portions of Exhibit 9 to the Declaration of Andrew D. Silverman in Support of Oracle's Motions in Limine

This filing is in physical form only, and is being maintained in the case file in the Clerk's office. If you are a participant on this case, this filing will be served shortly.

For information on retrieving this filing directly from the Court, please see the Court's main web site at <http://www.cand.uscourts.gov> under Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ).

This filing was not efiled for the following reason(s):

☐ Unable to Scan Documents

☐ Physical Object (please describe):

☐ Non-Graphic/Text Computer File (audio, video, etc.) on CD or other media

☐ Item Under Seal in Criminal Case

☐ Conformance with the Judicial Conference Privacy Policy (General Order 53)

☒ Other (please describe): Exhibits D, G, and I to the Expert Report of Dr. Itamar Simonson, attached as Exhibit 9 to the Declaration of Andrew D. Silverman, are Microsoft Excel spreadsheets containing a significant amount of data in many cells across multiple sheets. If printed or converted to a PDF file, the documents would span many pages and would be unwieldy to use.

Dated: March 23, 2016

ORRICK, HERRINGTON &
SUTCLIFFE LLP

By: 

ANDREW D. SILVERMAN

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ORACLE AMERICA, INC.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within-entitled action. My business address is Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP, 1000 Marsh Road, Menlo Park, California 94025. On March 23, 2016, I served the following document(s):

**NOTICE OF MANUAL FILING RE: PORTIONS OF
EXHIBIT 9 TO THE DECLARATION OF ANDREW D.
SILVERMAN IN SUPPORT OF ORACLE'S MOTIONS IN
LIMINE**

**MANUALLY FILED PORTIONS OF EXHIBIT 9 TO THE
DECLARATION OF ANDREW D. SILVERMAN**

on the interested parties in this action by electronic service [Fed. Rule Civ. Proc. 5(b)] by electronically mailing true and correct copies to: DALVIK@kvn.com

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on March 23, 2016, at San Francisco, California.



José E. Valdés

Revised Final
12-23-15

#15151 APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY

SPECS

N=150 or 200
At least ½ of the respondents MUST be Android App Developers (response 2 in QA4)

SCREENER

(INTERVIEWING SHOULD NOT BE CONDUCTED WITH ANYONE WHO HAS A HEARING OR ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROBLEM.)

{Programming Note: Move in from sample NAME.}
NAME. Move in name from sample

{Programming Note: Move in from sample PHONE NUMBER}
PHONE. Move in phone number from sample

Hello, I’m_____ from Target Research Group, a nationwide market research organization. We’re conducting a very short survey with application developers, and we’d like to include your opinions. If you qualify and complete the survey, we will mail you \$25 to thank you for your cooperation. We are not selling anything; we are only interested in your opinions, which will be held in the strictest confidence.

QA1. May I speak to INSERT NAME FROM LIST. {Programming Note: IF QA1=1, GO TO QA2; IF QA1=2, SCHEDULE CALLBACK; OTHERWISE TERMINATE}

- 1. Respondent is available
- 2. Respondent is not currently available, can schedule appointment/call back
- 3. Respondent is not available, cannot schedule appointment/callback
- 4. Name on sample does not match actual name.
- 9. Don’t know
- 0. Refused

If Response 2, say: “May I please have a good date and time to call them back?”
CALLBACK SCHEDULING. INTERVIEWER: SCHEDULE CALLBACK DATE & TIME WITH RESPONDENT 2 DAYS FROM TODAY.

CALLBACK DATE. {RECORD RESPONDENT’S CALLBACK DATE}

CALLBACK TIME. {RECORD RESPONDENT’S CALLBACK TIME}

INTERVIEWER: READ CALLBACK DATE & TIME TO RESPONDENT.

THANK: Thank you. We appreciate your help on this research project. We will call them on the Date & Time just discussed. However, if they would prefer to contact us earlier, please have them call 1-800-xxx-xxxx and mention project number XXX. Goodbye.

{QA2 MUST=1; OTHERWISE TERMINATE}
QA2. Do or don't you or your firm develop applications for smartphones or tablets?

1 Yes
2 No
9 Don't know

QA3. Are you the person who makes or influences the decision whether to develop new applications?

{Programming Note: MUST BE “YES” TO CONTINUE}

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 9 Don’t know

QA4. For which, if any, of the following platforms have you or your firm developed applications? **RECORD ALL THAT APPLY.**

{PROGRAMMER: ROTATE ORDER OF FIRST 4 ANSWER RESPONSES}

{KEEP TRACK OF RESPONSE 2 SELECTIONS—NEED AT LEAST ½ (75-100) OF THE RESPONDENTS TO BE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET APP DEVELOPERS}

- 1. Apple iPhones or iPads
- 2. Android phones or tablets →**NEED AT LEAST ½ OF THE RESPONDENTS TO SELECT THIS**
- 3. Blackberry devices
- 4. Microsoft or Nokia phones or tablets
- 5. None of the above →**TERMINATE**

QA5. Does any member of your household work for a market research firm, an advertising agency or a public relations firm? **(RECORD “YES,” “NO,” OR “DON’T KNOW”)**

{Programming Note: IF “YES” OR “DON’T KNOW”, TERMINATE}

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 9 Don’t know

QB. Thank you. You qualify for this study.

#15151 APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY

MAIN QUESTIONNAIRE

**(INTERVIEWER NOTE:
READ EACH OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS SLOWLY; IF NEEDED, REREAD THE
QUESTION, WITHOUT PARAPHRASING)**

Q1. First, when answering the questions, if you don't know the answer or don't have an opinion, please don't guess; just tell me you don't know, and we'll go on to the next question.

Q1a. **[READ SLOWLY]** Suppose a new platform for mobile devices, in addition to the existing platforms, was introduced two years ago.

What factors or considerations will influence your decision today whether or not to develop applications for this platform first introduced two years ago? **(RECORD EACH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION VERBATIM ON SEPARATE LINE BELOW).**

First Factor/Consideration: _____

Second Factor/Consideration: _____

Third Factor/Consideration: _____

Fourth Factor/Consideration: _____

None....() (SKIP TO Q.4a)

Q1b. Any other factors or considerations that will influence your decision today whether to develop applications for this platform? **(RECORD EACH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION VERBATIM ON SEPARATE LINE BELOW)**

Fifth Factor/Consideration: _____

Sixth Factor/Consideration: _____

Seventh Factor/Consideration: _____

Eighth Factor/Consideration: _____

{PROGRAMMER: IF "NONE" SELECTED IN Q.1a, SKIP TO Q4a}

Q2a. Which one of the factors or considerations you mentioned will be the most important in your decision whether to develop applications for that mobile device platform that was introduced two years ago?

{PROGRAMMER: PIPE IN ANSWERS FROM Q1a AND Q1b}

(INTERVIEWER: SELECT THE APPROPRIATE ANSWER FROM THE PIPED IN ANSWERS)

Q2b. What makes you say that **(INSERT ANSWER FROM Q2a)** will be the most important factor or consideration in your decision whether to develop applications for that mobile device platform?

[OPEN END]

Q2c. Any other reason?

[OPEN END]

{PROGRAMMER: IF ONLY ONE FACTOR/CONSIDERATION LISTED IN Q1a/1b, SKIP TO Q4a}

- Q3a. Which one of the factors or considerations that you mentioned will be the second most important in your decision whether to develop applications for that mobile device platform?
{PROGRAMMER: PIPE IN ANSWERS FROM Q1a AND Q1b—NOT including the answer from Q2a}
(INTERVIEWER: SELECT THE APPROPRIATE ANSWER FROM THE PIPED IN ANSWERS)

- Q3b. What makes you say that **(INSERT ANSWER FROM Q3a)** will be the second most important factor or consideration in your decision whether to develop applications for that mobile device platform?

[OPEN END]
-

- Q3c. Any other reason?

[OPEN END]
-

- Q4a. **[READ SLOWLY]** Suppose now you are approached by a promoter for a mobile device platform that has been around for a few years, but so far you have not developed any application for that platform.

What is the first thing you would want to know from the promoter about that platform before deciding if you'll develop applications for that platform?

[OPEN END]
-

- Q4b. What is the second thing you would want to know from the promoter about that platform before deciding if you'll develop applications for that platform?

[OPEN END]
-

{PROGRAMMER: ASK Q5a-5c FOR “ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET” IF SELECTED IN QA4. IF NOT SELECTED, SKIP TO INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE Q.6a} Limit answer to 4 digit numeric response; only accept the year 2007 OR LATER

- Q5a. You mentioned earlier that you have developed applications for the Android phone or tablet platform. As best as you remember, what year did you start offering applications for the Android phone or tablet platform?

[OPEN END]
-

- Q5b. As best as you remember, what factors or considerations led to your decision to develop applications for the Android phone or tablet platform? **(RECORD EACH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION VERBATIM ON SEPARATE LINE BELOW)**
- First Factor/Consideration: _____
- Second Factor/Consideration: _____
- Third Factor/Consideration: _____
- Fourth Factor/Consideration: _____

None....() (SKIP TO INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE Q.6a)

Q5c. Any other factors or considerations that led to your decision to develop applications for the Android phone or tablet platform? **(RECORD EACH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION VERBATIM ON SEPARATE LINE BELOW)**

Fifth Factor/Consideration: _____

Sixth Factor/Consideration: _____

Seventh Factor/Consideration: _____

Eighth Factor/Consideration: _____

{PROGRAMMER: ASK Q6a-6c FOR ONE OTHER PLATFORM SELECTED IN QA4. IF NO OTHER PLATFORM SELECTED IN QA4, SKIP TO INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE Q.7a}

Limit answer to 4 digit numeric response; only accept the year 2007 OR LATER

Q6a. You mentioned earlier that you have developed applications for the **(INSERT ANSWER FROM QA4)** platform. As best as you remember, what year did you start offering applications for the **(INSERT ANSWER FROM QA4)** platform?

[OPEN END]

Q6b. As best as you remember, what factors or considerations led to your decision to develop applications for the **(INSERT ANSWER FROM QA4)** platform? **(RECORD EACH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION VERBATIM ON SEPARATE LINE BELOW)**

First Factor/Consideration: _____

Second Factor/Consideration: _____

Third Factor/Consideration: _____

Fourth Factor/Consideration: _____

None....() (SKIP TO INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE Q.7-1a or 7-2a)

Q6c. Any other factors or considerations that led to your decision to develop applications for the **(INSERT ANSWER FROM QA4)** platform? **(RECORD EACH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION VERBATIM ON SEPARATE LINE BELOW)**

Fifth Factor/Consideration: _____

Sixth Factor/Consideration: _____

Seventh Factor/Consideration: _____

Eighth Factor/Consideration: _____

{PROGRAMMER: ROTATE THE ORDER OF QUESTIONS 7a-7c AND 8a-8c}

{PROGRAMMER: ½ THE RESPONDENTS ARE ASKED THE 7-1 SERIES AND THE OTHER ½ ARE ASKED THE 7-2 SERIES}

Q7-1a. **[READ SLOWLY]** Suppose a platform that was introduced a couple of years ago, has recently gained in popularity in terms of number of users. In a situation like that, how would you rate your capability to learn to develop applications for that platform assuming it requires using a new and different programming language that you have not used before?

The rating you give should be from 0, which means “Completely incapable of learning to develop applications for that platform” to 10, which means “Completely capable of learning to develop applications for that platform.” **(RECORD A NUMBER BETWEEN 0 AND 10)**

[RECORD NUMBER]

Q7-1b. What makes you give that rating?

[OPEN END]

Q7-1c. Any other reason?

[OPEN END]

Q7-2a. **[READ SLOWLY]** Suppose a platform that was introduced a couple of years ago, has recently gained in popularity in terms of number of users. In a situation like that, how would you rate your capability to learn to develop applications for that platform assuming it requires using a new and different programming language that you have not used before?

The rating you give should be from 10, which means “Completely capable of learning to develop applications for that platform,” to 0, which means “Completely incapable of learning to develop applications for that platform.” **(RECORD A NUMBER BETWEEN 0 AND 10)**

[RECORD NUMBER]

Q7-2b. What makes you give that rating?

[OPEN END]

Q7-2c. Any other reason?

[OPEN END]

{PROGRAMMER: ½ THE RESPONDENTS ARE ASKED THE 8-1 SERIES AND THE OTHER ½ ARE ASKED THE 8-2 SERIES}

Q8-1a. **[READ SLOWLY]** Please rate your capability to develop and establish in the market a completely new programming language for use in mobile applications that is different from all existing programming languages.

The rating you give should be from 0, which means “Completely incapable of developing and establishing a new programming language for mobile applications that is different from all existing programming languages,” to 10 which means “Completely capable of developing and establishing a new programming language for use in mobile applications that is different from all existing programming languages.” **(RECORD A NUMBER BETWEEN 0 AND 10)**

[RECORD NUMBER]

Q8-1b. What makes you give that rating?

[OPEN END]

Q8-1c. Any other reason?

[OPEN END]

Q8-2a. **[READ SLOWLY]** Please rate your capability to develop and establish in the market a completely new programming language for use in mobile applications that is different from all existing programming languages.

The rating you give should be from 10, which means “Completely capable of developing and establishing a new programming language for mobile applications that is different from all existing programming languages,” to 0 which means “Completely incapable of developing and establishing a new programming language for use in mobile applications that is different from all existing programming languages.” **(RECORD A NUMBER BETWEEN 0 AND 10)**

[RECORD NUMBER]

Q8-2b. What makes you give that rating?

[OPEN END]

Q8-2c. Any other reason?

[OPEN END]

{PROGRAMMER: ½ THE RESPONDENTS ARE ASKED THE 9-1 SERIES AND THE OTHER ½ ARE ASKED THE 9-2 SERIES}

Q9-1. **[READ SLOWLY]** In general, based on your prior experience in developing applications for mobile platforms, how would you rate the importance of the following six factors when deciding to commit resources to developing applications for a particular mobile platform?

For each factor, please indicate its importance using a scale from 0 to 10 with 0 meaning “Not at all important,” and 10 meaning “Extremely important.”

{PROGRAMMER: RANDOMIZE ORDER OF 6 ITEMS; RECORD A NUMBER BETWEEN 0 AND 10 FOR EACH ITEM}

How would you rate the importance of (READ ITEM)?

1. The number of users or devices already using the platform
2. Your prior familiarity with the programming language used by the platform
3. The ease or difficulty of getting new applications approved for sale by the platform owner
4. The percentage of revenue from purchases of the application retained by the platform owner
5. The brand strength and marketing resources of the platform owner
6. Whether the platform at issue is an open or closed ecosystem

Q9-2. **[READ SLOWLY]** In general, based on your prior experience in developing applications for mobile platforms, how would you rate the importance of the following six factors when deciding to commit resources to developing applications for a particular mobile platform?

For each factor, please indicate its importance using a scale from 10 to 0 with 10 meaning “Extremely important,” and 0 meaning “Not at all important.”

{PROGRAMMER: RANDOMIZE ORDER OF 6 ITEMS; RECORD A NUMBER BETWEEN 0 AND 10 FOR EACH ITEM}

How would you rate the importance of (READ ITEM)?

1. The number of users or devices already using the platform
2. Your prior familiarity with the programming language used by the platform
3. The ease or difficulty of getting new applications approved for sale by the platform owner
4. The percentage of revenue from purchases of the application retained by the platform owner
5. The brand strength and marketing resources of the platform owner
6. Whether the platform at issue is an open or closed ecosystem

{PROGRAMMER: ASK Q10a-10b FOR “APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS” IF SELECTED IN Q.A4}

Q10a. Have you or your firm developed applications for iOS written in the Objective-C language?

{IF RESPONSE 1 SELECTED, ASK Q10b; OTHERWISE, SKIP TO Q12}

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 9 Don’t know

Q10b. **[READ SLOWLY]** Prior to developing applications for iOS, did you know the Objective-C programming language, did you have to learn it, or did you hire an experienced Objective-C developer to develop for iOS? **(READ RESPONSES AGAIN IF NECESSARY)**

- 1 You knew the Objective-C programming language, or
- 2 You had to learn the Objective-C programming language, or
- 3 You hired an experienced Objective-C developer to develop for iOS
- 4 Don't know **(DO NOT READ)**

Q11. Over the past two years, Apple has introduced and updated a new programming language called Swift. Do you or don't you plan to learn Swift for your applications development work for iOS? **(SELECT ONE RESPONSE)**

- 1 Yes, I do
- 2 No, I don't
- 9 Don't know

{Programming Note: Insert phone number from sample}

Q12. My supervisor may call you to verify that you completed this survey. Can I please have your first and last name and your full address so we can mail you your \$25.00?

RFNAME. **{RECORD RESPONDENT'S FIRST NAME}**

RLNAME. **{RECORD RESPONDENT'S LAST NAME}**

RADDRESS. **{RECORD RESPONDENT'S CITY, STATE AND ZIP CODE}**

And may I verify that the number I reached you at is...? VRPHONE (INSERT PHONE) [VERIFY PHONE]

Q13. Those are all of the questions I have. Thank you for your time and participation.

CODE GENDER (DO NOT ASK)

- 1 Male
- 2 Female
- 9 Don't know

#15151 APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY

SPECS

N=150 or 200
At least ½ of the respondents MUST be Android App Developers (response 2 in QA4)

SCREENER

(INTERVIEWING SHOULD NOT BE CONDUCTED WITH ANYONE WHO HAS A HEARING OR ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROBLEM.)

{Programming Note: Move in from sample NAME.}
NAME. Move in name from sample

{Programming Note: Move in from sample PHONE NUMBER}
PHONE. Move in phone number from sample

Hello, I'm_____ from Target Research Group, a nationwide market research organization. We're conducting a very short survey with application developers, and we'd like to include your opinions. If you qualify and complete the survey, we will mail you \$25 to thank you for your cooperation. We are not selling anything; we are only interested in your opinions, which will be held in the strictest confidence.

QA1. May I speak to INSERT NAME FROM LIST. {Programming Note: IF QA1=1, GO TO QA2; IF QA1=2, SCHEDULE CALLBACK; OTHERWISE TERMINATE}

- 1. Respondent is available
- 2. Respondent is not currently available, can schedule appointment/call back
- 3. Respondent is not available, cannot schedule appointment/callback
- 4. Name on sample does not match actual name.
- 9. Don't know
- 0. Refused

If Response 2, say: "May I please have a good date and time to call them back?"
CALLBACK SCHEDULING. INTERVIEWER: SCHEDULE CALLBACK DATE & TIME WITH RESPONDENT 2 DAYS FROM TODAY.

CALLBACK DATE. {RECORD RESPONDENT'S CALLBACK DATE}

CALLBACK TIME. {RECORD RESPONDENT'S CALLBACK TIME}

INTERVIEWER: READ CALLBACK DATE & TIME TO RESPONDENT.

THANK: Thank you. We appreciate your help on this research project. We will call them on the Date & Time just discussed. However, if they would prefer to contact us earlier, please have them call 1-800-xxx-xxxx and mention project number XXX. Goodbye.

{QA2 MUST=1; OTHERWISE TERMINATE}
QA2. Do or don't you or your firm develop applications for smartphones or tablets?

1 Yes
2 No
9 Don't know

QA3. Are you the person who makes or influences the decision whether to develop new applications?

{Programming Note: MUST BE “YES” TO CONTINUE}

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 9 Don't know

QA4. For which, if any, of the following platforms have you or your firm developed applications? **RECORD ALL THAT APPLY.**

{PROGRAMMER: ROTATE ORDER OF FIRST 4 ANSWER RESPONSES}

{KEEP TRACK OF RESPONSE 2 SELECTIONS—NEED AT LEAST ½ (75-100) OF THE RESPONDENTS TO BE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET APP DEVELOPERS}

- 1. Apple iPhones or iPads
- 2. Android phones or tablets →**NEED AT LEAST ½ OF THE RESPONDENTS TO SELECT THIS**
- 3. Blackberry devices
- 4. Microsoft or Nokia phones or tablets
- 5. None of the above →**TERMINATE**

QA5. Does any member of your household work for a market research firm, an advertising agency or a public relations firm? **(RECORD “YES,” “NO,” OR “DON'T KNOW”)**

{Programming Note: IF “YES” OR “DON'T KNOW”, TERMINATE}

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 9 Don't know

QB. Thank you. You qualify for this study.

#15151 APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY

MAIN QUESTIONNAIRE

**(INTERVIEWER NOTE:
READ EACH OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS SLOWLY; IF NEEDED, REREAD THE
QUESTION, WITHOUT PARAPHRASING)**

Q1. First, when answering the questions, if you don't know the answer or don't have an opinion, please don't guess; just tell me you don't know, and we'll go on to the next question.

Q1a. **[READ SLOWLY]** Suppose a new platform for mobile devices, in addition to the existing platforms, was introduced two years ago.

What factors or considerations will influence your decision today whether or not to develop applications for this platform first introduced two years ago? **(RECORD EACH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION VERBATIM ON SEPARATE LINE BELOW).**

First Factor/Consideration: _____

Second Factor/Consideration: _____

Third Factor/Consideration: _____

Fourth Factor/Consideration: _____

None....() (SKIP TO Q.4a)

Q1b. Any other factors or considerations that will influence your decision today whether to develop applications for this platform? **(RECORD EACH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION VERBATIM ON SEPARATE LINE BELOW)**

Fifth Factor/Consideration: _____

Sixth Factor/Consideration: _____

Seventh Factor/Consideration: _____

Eighth Factor/Consideration: _____

{PROGRAMMER: IF "NONE" SELECTED IN Q.1a, SKIP TO Q4a}

Q2a. Which one of the factors or considerations you mentioned will be the most important in your decision whether to develop applications for that mobile device platform that was introduced two years ago?

{PROGRAMMER: PIPE IN ANSWERS FROM Q1a AND Q1b}

(INTERVIEWER: SELECT THE APPROPRIATE ANSWER FROM THE PIPED IN ANSWERS)

Q2b. What makes you say that **(INSERT ANSWER FROM Q2a)** will be the most important factor or consideration in your decision whether to develop applications for that mobile device platform?

[OPEN END]

Q2c. Any other reason?

[OPEN END]

{PROGRAMMER: IF ONLY ONE FACTOR/CONSIDERATION LISTED IN Q1a/1b, SKIP TO Q4a}

- Q3a. Which one of the factors or considerations that you mentioned will be the second most important in your decision whether to develop applications for that mobile device platform?
{PROGRAMMER: PIPE IN ANSWERS FROM Q1a AND Q1b—NOT including the answer from Q2a}
(INTERVIEWER: SELECT THE APPROPRIATE ANSWER FROM THE PIPED IN ANSWERS)

- Q3b. What makes you say that **(INSERT ANSWER FROM Q3a)** will be the second most important factor or consideration in your decision whether to develop applications for that mobile device platform?
[OPEN END]
-

- Q3c. Any other reason?
[OPEN END]
-

- Q4a. **[READ SLOWLY]** Suppose now you are approached by a promoter for a mobile device platform that has been around for a few years, but so far you have not developed any application for that platform.

What is the first thing you would want to know from the promoter about that platform before deciding if you'll develop applications for that platform?
[OPEN END]
-

- Q4b. What is the second thing you would want to know from the promoter about that platform before deciding if you'll develop applications for that platform?
[OPEN END]
-

{PROGRAMMER: ASK Q5a-5c FOR “ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET” IF SELECTED IN QA4. IF NOT SELECTED, SKIP TO INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE Q.6a} Limit answer to 4 digit numeric response; only accept the year 2007 OR LATER

- Q5a. You mentioned earlier that you have developed applications for the Android phone or tablet platform. As best as you remember, what year did you start offering applications for the Android phone or tablet platform?
[OPEN END]
-

- Q5b. As best as you remember, what factors or considerations led to your decision to develop applications for the Android phone or tablet platform? **(RECORD EACH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION VERBATIM ON SEPARATE LINE BELOW)**
- First Factor/Consideration: _____
- Second Factor/Consideration: _____
- Third Factor/Consideration: _____
- Fourth Factor/Consideration: _____

None....() (SKIP TO INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE Q.6a)

Q5c. Any other factors or considerations that led to your decision to develop applications for the Android phone or tablet platform? **(RECORD EACH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION VERBATIM ON SEPARATE LINE BELOW)**

Fifth Factor/Consideration: _____

Sixth Factor/Consideration: _____

Seventh Factor/Consideration: _____

Eighth Factor/Consideration: _____

{PROGRAMMER: ASK Q6a-6c FOR ONE OTHER PLATFORM SELECTED IN QA4. IF NO OTHER PLATFORM SELECTED IN QA4, SKIP TO INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE Q.7a}

Limit answer to 4 digit numeric response; only accept the year 2007 OR LATER

Q6a. You mentioned earlier that you have developed applications for the **(INSERT ANSWER FROM QA4)** platform. As best as you remember, what year did you start offering applications for the **(INSERT ANSWER FROM QA4)** platform?

[OPEN END]

Q6b. As best as you remember, what factors or considerations led to your decision to develop applications for the **(INSERT ANSWER FROM QA4)** platform? **(RECORD EACH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION VERBATIM ON SEPARATE LINE BELOW)**

First Factor/Consideration: _____

Second Factor/Consideration: _____

Third Factor/Consideration: _____

Fourth Factor/Consideration: _____

None....() (SKIP TO INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE Q.7-1a or 7-2a)

Q6c. Any other factors or considerations that led to your decision to develop applications for the **(INSERT ANSWER FROM QA4)** platform? **(RECORD EACH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION VERBATIM ON SEPARATE LINE BELOW)**

Fifth Factor/Consideration: _____

Sixth Factor/Consideration: _____

Seventh Factor/Consideration: _____

Eighth Factor/Consideration: _____

{PROGRAMMER: ROTATE THE ORDER OF QUESTIONS 7a-7c AND 8a-8c}

{PROGRAMMER: ½ THE RESPONDENTS ARE ASKED THE 7-1 SERIES AND THE OTHER ½ ARE ASKED THE 7-2 SERIES}

Q7-1a. **[READ SLOWLY]** Suppose a platform that was introduced a couple of years ago, has recently gained in popularity in terms of number of users. In a situation like that, how would you rate your capability to learn to develop applications for that platform assuming it requires using a new and different programming language that you have not used before?

The rating you give should be from 0, which means “Completely incapable of learning to develop applications for that platform” to 10, which means “Completely capable of learning to develop applications for that platform.” **(RECORD A NUMBER BETWEEN 0 AND 10)**

[RECORD NUMBER]

Q7-1b. What makes you give that rating?

[OPEN END]

Q7-1c. Any other reason?

[OPEN END]

Q7-2a. **[READ SLOWLY]** Suppose a platform that was introduced a couple of years ago, has recently gained in popularity in terms of number of users. In a situation like that, how would you rate your capability to learn to develop applications for that platform assuming it requires using a new and different programming language that you have not used before?

The rating you give should be from 10, which means “Completely capable of learning to develop applications for that platform,” to 0, which means “Completely incapable of learning to develop applications for that platform.” **(RECORD A NUMBER BETWEEN 0 AND 10)**

[RECORD NUMBER]

Q7-2b. What makes you give that rating?

[OPEN END]

Q7-2c. Any other reason?

[OPEN END]

{PROGRAMMER: ½ THE RESPONDENTS ARE ASKED THE 8-1 SERIES AND THE OTHER ½ ARE ASKED THE 8-2 SERIES}

Q8-1a. **[READ SLOWLY]** Please rate your capability to develop and establish a completely new programming language in the market for use in mobile applications that is different from all existing programming languages.

The rating you give should be from 0, which means “Completely incapable of developing and establishing a new programming language for mobile applications that is different from all existing programming languages,” to 10 which means “Completely capable of developing and establishing a new programming language for use in mobile applications that is different from all existing programming languages.” **(RECORD A NUMBER BETWEEN 0 AND 10)**

[RECORD NUMBER]

Q8-1b. What makes you give that rating?

[OPEN END]

Q8-1c. Any other reason?

[OPEN END]

Q8-2a. **[READ SLOWLY]** Please rate your capability to develop and establish a completely new programming language in the market for use in mobile applications that is different from all existing programming languages.

The rating you give should be from 10, which means “Completely capable of developing and establishing a new programming language for mobile applications that is different from all existing programming languages,” to 0 which means “Completely incapable of developing and establishing a new programming language for use in mobile applications that is different from all existing programming languages.” **(RECORD A NUMBER BETWEEN 0 AND 10)**

[RECORD NUMBER]

Q8-2b. What makes you give that rating?

[OPEN END]

Q8-2c. Any other reason?

[OPEN END]

{PROGRAMMER: ½ THE RESPONDENTS ARE ASKED THE 9-1 SERIES AND THE OTHER ½ ARE ASKED THE 9-2 SERIES}

Q9-1. **[READ SLOWLY]** In general, based on your prior experience in developing applications for mobile platforms, how would you rate the importance of the following six factors when deciding to commit resources to developing applications for a particular mobile platform?

For each factor, please indicate its importance using a scale from 0 to 10 with 0 meaning “Not at all important,” and 10 meaning “Extremely important.”

{PROGRAMMER: RANDOMIZE ORDER OF 6 ITEMS; RECORD A NUMBER BETWEEN 0 AND 10 FOR EACH ITEM}

How would you rate the importance of (READ ITEM)?

1. The number of users or devices already using the platform
2. Your prior familiarity with the programming language used by the platform
3. The ease or difficulty of getting new applications approved for sale by the platform owner
4. The percentage of revenue from purchases of the application retained by the platform owner
5. The brand strength and marketing resources of the platform owner
6. Whether the platform at issue is an open or closed ecosystem

Q9-2. **[READ SLOWLY]** In general, based on your prior experience in developing applications for mobile platforms, how would you rate the importance of the following six factors when deciding to commit resources to developing applications for a particular mobile platform?

For each factor, please indicate its importance using a scale from 10 to 0 with 10 meaning “Extremely important,” and 0 meaning “Not at all important.”

{PROGRAMMER: RANDOMIZE ORDER OF 6 ITEMS; RECORD A NUMBER BETWEEN 0 AND 10 FOR EACH ITEM}

How would you rate the importance of (READ ITEM)?

1. The number of users or devices already using the platform
2. Your prior familiarity with the programming language used by the platform
3. The ease or difficulty of getting new applications approved for sale by the platform owner
4. The percentage of revenue from purchases of the application retained by the platform owner
5. The brand strength and marketing resources of the platform owner
6. Whether the platform at issue is an open or closed ecosystem

{PROGRAMMER: ASK Q10a-10b FOR “APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS” IF SELECTED IN Q.A4}

Q10a. Have you or your firm developed applications for iOS written in the Objective-C language?

{IF RESPONSE 1 SELECTED, ASK Q10b; OTHERWISE, SKIP TO Q12}

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 9 Don't know

Q10b. **[READ SLOWLY]** Prior to developing applications for iOS, did you know the Objective-C programming language, did you have to learn it, or did you hire an experienced Objective-C developer to develop for iOS? **(READ RESPONSES AGAIN IF NECESSARY)**

- 1 You knew the Objective-C programming language, or
- 2 You had to learn the Objective-C programming language, or
- 3 You hired an experienced Objective-C developer to develop for iOS
- 4 Don't know **(DO NOT READ)**

Q11. Over the past two years, Apple has introduced and updated a new programming language called Swift. Do you or don't you plan to learn Swift for your applications development work for iOS? **(SELECT ONE RESPONSE)**

- 1 Yes, I do
- 2 No, I don't
- 9 Don't know

Q11a. In general, do you make decisions about which applications to develop independently, or as part of a team of application developers? **(READ RESPONSES ONLY IF NECESSARY)**

- 1 Independently
- 2 As part of a team of application developers
- 3 Both, sometimes independently and sometimes as part of a team of application developers

{Programming Note: Insert phone number from sample}

Q12. My supervisor may call you to verify that you completed this survey. Can I please have your first and last name and your full address so we can mail you your \$25.00?

RFNAME. **{RECORD RESPONDENT'S FIRST NAME}**

RLNAME. **{RECORD RESPONDENT'S LAST NAME}**

RADDRESS. **{RECORD RESPONDENT'S CITY, STATE AND ZIP CODE}**

And may I verify that the number I reached you at is...? VRPHONE (INSERT PHONE) [VERIFY PHONE]

Q13. Those are all of the questions I have. Thank you for your time and participation.

CODE GENDER (DO NOT ASK)

- 1 Male
- 2 Female
- 9 Don't know

28 January 2016

Page 1

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Page ----	Table -----	Title -----
1	1	Q.A2 DO OR DON'T YOU OR YOUR FIRM DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR SMARTPHONES OR TABLETS?
2	2	Q.A3 ARE YOU THE PERSON WHO MAKES OR INFLUENCES THE DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP NEW APPLICATIONS?
3	3	Q.A4 FOR WHICH, IF ANY, OF THE FOLLOWING PLATFORMS HAVE YOU OR YOUR FIRM DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS?
4	4	Q.1A WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY WHETHER OR NOT TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM FIRST INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)
18	5	Q.1B ANY OTHER FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM? (FIFTH-SEVENTH FACTORS)
23	6	Q.1A/1B TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))
30	7	Q.2A WHICH ONE OF THE FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS YOU MENTIONED WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM THAT WAS INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO?
35	8	Q.2B/2C WHAT MAKES YOU SAY THAT (ANSWER FROM Q2A) WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM? ANY OTHER REASON?
42	9	Q.3A WHICH ONE OF THE FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT YOU MENTIONED WILL BE THE SECOND MOST IMPORTANT IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM?
47	10	Q.3B/3C WHAT MAKES YOU SAY THAT (ANSWER FROM Q3A) WILL BE THE SECOND MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM? ANY OTHER REASON?
53	11	NET OF Q.2A/3A FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS YOU MENTIONED WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT/SECOND MOST IMPORTANT IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM THAT WAS INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO?
60	12	NET OF Q.2B/2C/3B/3C WHAT MAKES YOU SAY THAT (ANSWER FROM Q2A/3A) WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT/2ND MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM? ANY OTHER REASON?
67	13	Q.4A SUPPOSE NOW YOU ARE APPROACHED BY A PROMOTER FOR A MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM THAT HAS BEEN AROUND FOR A FEW YEARS, BUT SO FAR YOU HAVE NOT DEVELOPED ANY APPLICATION FOR THAT PLATFORM. WHAT IS THE FIRST THING YOU WOULD WANT TO KNOW FROM THE PROMOTER ABOUT THAT PLATFORM BEFORE DECIDING IF YOU'LL DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT PLATFORM?
73	14	NET OF Q.4A/4B FIRST/SECOND THING YOU WOULD WANT TO KNOW FROM THE PROMOTER ABOUT THAT PLATFORM BEFORE DECIDING IF YOU'LL DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT PLATFORM.
80	15	Q.5A YOU MENTIONED EARLIER THAT YOU HAVE DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM. AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT YEAR DID YOU START OFFERING APPLICATIONS FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM?

28 January 2016

Page 2

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Page ----	Table -----	Title -----
81	16	Q.5B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)
94	17	Q.5C ANY OTHER FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM? (FIFTH-SEVENTH FACTORS)
99	18	Q.5B/5C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))
106	19	Q.6A YOU MENTIONED EARLIER THAT YOU HAVE DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM. AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT YEAR DID YOU START OFFERING APPLICATIONS FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM?
107	20	Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)
122	21	Q.6C ANY OTHER FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM? (FIFTH-SEVENTH FACTORS)
126	22	Q.6B/6C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LET TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))
133	23	Q.6A YOU MENTIONED EARLIER THAT YOU HAVE DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR THE BLACKBERRY DEVICES PLATFORM. AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT YEAR DID YOU START OFFERING APPLICATIONS FOR THE BLACKBERRY DEVICES PLATFORM?
134	24	Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THE BLACKBERRY DEVICES PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)
136	25	Q.6B/6C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LET TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THE BLACKBERRY DEVICES PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))
138	26	Q.6A YOU MENTIONED EARLIER THAT YOU HAVE DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR THE MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS PLATFORM. AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT YEAR DID YOU START OFFERING APPLICATIONS FOR THE MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS PLATFORM?
139	27	Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THE MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)
144	28	Q.6C ANY OTHER FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THE MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS PLATFORM? (FIFTH-SEVENTH FACTORS)
145	29	Q.6B/6C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LET TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THE MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))
149	30	Q.7-1A/Q.7-2A SUPPOSE A PLATFORM THAT WAS INTRODUCED A COUPLE OF YEARS AGO, HAS RECENTLY GAINED IN POPULARITY IN TERMS OF NUMBER OF USERS. IN A SITUATION LIKE THAT, HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR CAPABILITY TO LEARN TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT PLATFORM ASSUMING IT REQUIRES USING A NEW AND DIFFERENT PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE THAT YOU HAVE NOT USED BEFORE?

28 January 2016

Page 3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Page -----	Table -----	Title -----
150	31	Q.7-1B/7-1C/7-2B/7-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 8-10? ANY OTHER REASON?
154	32	Q.7-1B/7-1C/7-2B/7-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 5-7? ANY OTHER REASON?
158	33	Q.7-1B/7-1C/7-2B/7-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 0-4? ANY OTHER REASON?
160	34	Q.8-1A/Q.8-2A PLEASE RATE YOUR CAPABILITY TO DEVELOP AND ESTABLISH A COMPLETELY NEW PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE IN THE MARKET FOR USE IN MOBILE APPLICATIONS THAT IS DIFFERENT FROM ALL EXISTING PROGRAMMING LANGUAGES.
161	35	Q.8-1B/8-1C/8-2B/8-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 8-10? ANY OTHER REASON?
165	36	Q.8-1B/8-1C/8-2B/8-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 5-7? ANY OTHER REASON?
170	37	Q.8-1B/8-1C/8-2B/8-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 0-4? ANY OTHER REASON?
174	38	Q.9-1/Q.9-2 IN GENERAL, BASED ON YOUR PRIOR EXPERIENCE IN DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS FOR MOBILE PLATFORMS, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FOLLOWING SIX FACTORS WHEN DECIDING TO COMMIT RESOURCES TO DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS FOR A PARTICULAR MOBILE PLATFORM?
180	39	Q.10A HAVE YOU OR YOUR FIRM DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR IOS WRITTEN IN THE OBJECTIVE-C LANGUAGE?
181	40	Q.10B PRIOR TO DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS FOR IOS, DID YOU KNOW THE OBJECTIVE-C PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE, DID YOU HAVE TO LEARN IT, OR DID YOU HIRE AN EXPERIENCED OBJECTIVE-C DEVELOPER TO DEVELOP FOR IOS?
182	41	Q.11 OVER THE PAST TWO YEARS, APPLE HAS INTRODUCED AND UPDATED A NEW PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE CALLED SWIFT. DO YOU OR DON'T YOU PLAN TO LEARN SWIFT FOR YOUR APPLICATIONS DEVELOPMENT WORK FOR IOS?
183	42	Q.11A IN GENERAL, DO YOU MAKE DECISIONS ABOUT WHICH APPLICATIONS TO DEVELOP INDEPENDENTLY, OR AS PART OF A TEAM OF APPLICATION DEVELOPERS?
184	43	GENDER

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 1

Q.A2 DO OR DON'T YOU OR YOUR FIRM DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR SMARTPHONES OR TABLETS?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
YES	152
	100.0
NO	0
	0
DON'T KNOW	0
	0

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 2

Q.A3 ARE YOU THE PERSON WHO MAKES OR INFLUENCES THE DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP NEW APPLICATIONS?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
YES	152
	100.0
NO	0
	0
DON'T KNOW	0
	0

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 3

Q.A4 FOR WHICH, IF ANY, OF THE FOLLOWING PLATFORMS HAVE YOU OR YOUR FIRM DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS	132
	86.8
ANDROID PHONES OR TABLETS	116
	76.3
BLACKBERRY DEVICES	12
	7.9
MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS	23
	15.1
NONE OF THE ABOVE	0
	0

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 4

Q.1A WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY WHETHER OR NOT TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM FIRST INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
FIRST FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	148 97.4
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	94 61.8
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	93 61.2
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB- SUBNET)	1 0.7
PROFITABILITY/RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI)	1 0.7
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	19 12.5
ADOPTION RATE	2 1.3
PROJECTED MARKET SHARE/FUTURE OF PLATFORM	6 3.9
MARKET SHARE WAS GROWING/ BECOMING MORE POPULAR/THEY WERE CAPTURING THE MARKET	3 2.0
IS APP MARKETABLE/IS THERE A NEED/MARKET FOR IT/THE APP	3 2.0
WHERE DOES IT FIT IN THE CURRENT MARKET/TO SEE WHAT'S ALREADY IN THE MARKET/IS THIS A NEW APP/IDEA	3 2.0
THE MARKETPLACE/MARKET CONSIDERATIONS (UNSPEC)	2 1.3
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	2 1.3
(LIKE) THE COMPANY/BRAND (APPLE, GOOGLE, ETC)	2 1.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 4

Q.1A WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY WHETHER OR NOT TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM FIRST INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/ (CURRENT)	70
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	46.1
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY	1
DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF	1
USER BASE MENTIONS	0.7
MISCELLANEOUS USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/POPULARITY/RETURN	
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS USER BASE/	1
MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/POPULARITY/	0.7
RETURN MENTIONS	
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE	2
(NET)	1.3
TARGET MARKET/DEMOGRAPHIC/WHO IS	1
THE AUDIENCE/CUSTOMER	0.7
OTHER DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF	1
USER BASE MENTIONS	0.7
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	30
	19.7
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	11
	7.2
EASE OF USE/EASE/DIFFICULTY OF	5
DEVELOPMENT	3.3
EASE OF LEARNING LANGUAGE/HOW	4
FAST CAN I LEARN THE SYSTEM/	2.6
LANGUAGE	
TIME REQUIRED/TIME TO MARKET	1
	0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 4

Q.1A WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY WHETHER OR NOT TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM FIRST INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
INTEGRATION/EASE/ABILITY OF ADAPTING CURRENT CODE TO DIFFERENT PLATFORMS	3 2.0
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	3 2.0
COST TO DEVELOP	3 2.0
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	11 7.2
SUPPORT/RESOURCES AVAILABLE	2 1.3
DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT/IS IT ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY	1 0.7
DOCUMENTATION/AVAILABILITY/ QUALITY OF DOCUMENTATION	2 1.3
DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS AVAILABLE/WHAT IS THE SDK/API ACCESS	4 2.6
FRAMEWORK/IS THERE A FRAMEWORK AVAILABLE TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS	2 1.3
EXAMPLES/TEST ENVIRONMENTS/OTHER APPLICATIONS I COULD LOOK AT/ LEARN FROM	1 0.7
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	4 2.6
FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/ LANGUAGE (SUB-SUBNET)	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/LANGUAGE	
HAD EXPOSURE TO IT ALREADY/ ALREADY KNEW THE LANGUAGE/ BUILT ON A LANGUAGE I ALREADY KNEW	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 4

Q.1A WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY WHETHER OR NOT TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM FIRST INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (OF PLATFORM)/LIKE THE PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	3 2.0
MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES MENTIONS	1 0.7
PLATFORM (NET)	7 4.6
THE PLATFORM/WHAT PLATFORM IT'S BUILT ON	1 0.7
OPERATING SYSTEM OF PLATFORM	3 2.0
CAPABILITIES OF PLATFORM	2 1.3
SECURITY/SECURE PLATFORM	1 0.7
DEVICE RELATED (NET)	2 1.3
FEATURES OF DEVICE: RESOLUTION, SPEAKERS, ETC.	1 0.7
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	1 0.7
COMMITMENT TO PROJECT (NET)	2 1.3
MARKETING PLANS/HOW WILL IT BE MARKETED	1 0.7
(WHETHER) COMPANY IS/WAS BEHIND PROJECT/PRODUCT	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 4

Q.1A WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY WHETHER OR NOT TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM FIRST INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	7
	4.6
FUNCTIONALITY/PURPOSE OF APPLICATION/WHAT THEY WANT IT TO DO	2
	1.3
USER INTERFACE (UI)/EXPERIENCE	5
	3.3
COMPATIBILITY (NET)	3
	2.0
COMPATIBILITY WITH OTHER DEVICES/ OPERATING SYSTEMS/PLATFORMS	1
	0.7
OTHER COMPATIBILITY MENTIONS	2
	1.3
MISCELLANEOUS	
THE NEEDS OF THE CLIENT/IT WAS MY JOB/CLIENT/COMPANY REQUESTED	2
	1.3
NUMBER OF OTHER PEOPLE DEVELOPING FOR THAT PROGRAM	1
	0.7
THE TECHNOLOGY/TECHNOLOGICAL POTENTIAL	1
	0.7
THE ANALYTICS	1
	0.7
IS IT LEGAL/ARE THEIR COPYRIGHT ISSUES	1
	0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS MENTIONS	2
	1.3
SECOND FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	98
	64.5
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	34
	22.4

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 4

Q.1A WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY WHETHER OR NOT TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM FIRST INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	34
	22.4
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB-SUBNET)	6
	3.9
THE REMUNERATION/WAS ABLE TO MAKE MONEY/GET PAID	1
	0.7
PROFITABILITY/RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI)	2
	1.3
OTHER ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS MENTIONS	3
	2.0
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	10
	6.6
ADOPTION RATE	2
	1.3
PROJECTED MARKET SHARE/FUTURE OF PLATFORM	2
	1.3
MARKET SHARE WAS GROWING/ BECOMING MORE POPULAR/THEY WERE CAPTURING THE MARKET	1
	0.7
IS APP MARKETABLE/IS THERE A NEED/MARKET FOR IT/THE APP	1
	0.7
WHERE DOES IT FIT IN THE CURRENT MARKET/TO SEE WHAT'S ALREADY IN THE MARKET/IS THIS A NEW APP/IDEA	2
	1.3
THE MARKETPLACE/MARKET CONSIDERATIONS (UNSPEC)	2
	1.3
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/ (CURRENT)	18
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	11.8

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 4

Q.1A WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY WHETHER OR NOT TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM FIRST INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE (NET)	2 1.3
TARGET MARKET/DEMOGRAPHIC/WHO IS THE AUDIENCE/CUSTOMER	1 0.7
(ARE) USERS MORE AFFLUENT/HAVE MORE SPENDING POWER	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	39 25.7
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	21 13.8
EASE OF USE/EASE/DIFFICULTY OF DEVELOPMENT	15 9.9
EASE OF LEARNING LANGUAGE/HOW FAST CAN I LEARN THE SYSTEM/ LANGUAGE	2 1.3
TIME REQUIRED/TIME TO MARKET	3 2.0
INTEGRATION/EASE/ABILITY OF ADAPTING CURRENT CODE TO DIFFERENT PLATFORMS	2 1.3
OTHER TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	7 4.6
COST TO DEVELOP	4 2.6
COST OF DEVELOPMENT TOOLS/FEEES REQUIRED TO DEVELOP FOR THAT PROGRAM	2 1.3
OTHER DEVELOPMENT COSTS MENTIONS	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 4

Q.1A WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY WHETHER OR NOT TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM FIRST INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	8 5.3
SUPPORT/RESOURCES AVAILABLE	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT/IS IT ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY	1 0.7
DOCUMENTATION/AVAILABILITY/ QUALITY OF DOCUMENTATION	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS AVAILABLE/WHAT IS THE SDK/API ACCESS	2 1.3
FRAMEWORK/IS THERE A FRAMEWORK AVAILABLE TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS	2 1.3
OTHER SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT MENTIONS	1 0.7
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	3 2.0
MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (OF PLATFORM)/LIKE THE PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	3 2.0
MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	
AVAILABILITY OF DEVELOPERS TO WORK ON PLATFORM/PROJECT	3 2.0
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES MENTIONS	1 0.7
PLATFORM (NET)	3 2.0

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 4

Q.1A WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY WHETHER OR NOT TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM FIRST INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
THE PLATFORM/WHAT PLATFORM IT'S BUILT ON	1 0.7
(IS) PLATFORM OPEN/IS IT OPEN- SOURCE	1 0.7
OTHER PLATFORM MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEVICE RELATED (NET)	6 3.9
HAVE/LIKE THE DEVICE (I HAVE AN IPHONE, FAN OF ANDROID PHONES)	1 0.7
WHAT DEVICES THE PLATFORM WAS ON	1 0.7
FEATURES OF DEVICE: RESOLUTION, SPEAKERS, ETC.	4 2.6
COMMITMENT TO PROJECT (NET)	1 0.7
APP STORE/INTERFACE FOR SELLING APP	1 0.7
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	6 3.9
(UNDERSTANDING) THE APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS	1 0.7
FUNCTIONALITY/PURPOSE OF APPLICATION/WHAT THEY WANT IT TO DO	2 1.3
USER INTERFACE (UI)/EXPERIENCE	3 2.0
COMPATIBILITY (NET)	1 0.7
OTHER COMPATIBILITY MENTIONS	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 4

Q.1A WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY WHETHER OR NOT TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM FIRST INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MISCELLANEOUS	
THE NEEDS OF THE CLIENT/IT WAS MY JOB/CLIENT/COMPANY REQUESTED	1 0.7
NUMBER OF JOBS AVAILABLE DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS ON THAT PLATFORM	1 0.7
THE TECHNOLOGY/TECHNOLOGICAL POTENTIAL	2 1.3
SCALABILITY	2 1.3
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS MENTIONS	3 2.0
THIRD FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	37 24.3
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	14 9.2
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	14 9.2
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB- SUBNET)	4 2.6
THE REMUNERATION/WAS ABLE TO MAKE MONEY/GET PAID	1 0.7
PROFITABILITY/RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI)	3 2.0
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	5 3.3
PROJECTED MARKET SHARE/FUTURE OF PLATFORM	3 2.0
IS APP MARKETABLE/IS THERE A NEED/MARKET FOR IT/THE APP	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 4

Q.1A WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY WHETHER OR NOT TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM FIRST INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
WHERE DOES IT FIT IN THE CURRENT MARKET/TO SEE WHAT'S ALREADY IN THE MARKET/IS THIS A NEW APP/IDEA	1 0.7
THE GROWTH OF MOBILE APPLICATIONS/WANTED TO GET INTO THE GROWING MOBILE MARKET	1 0.7
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	1 0.7
WHAT COMPANY IS BEHIND THE PLATFORM	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/(CURRENT)	4
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	2.6
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE (NET)	3 2.0
TARGET MARKET/DEMOGRAPHIC/WHO IS THE AUDIENCE/CUSTOMER	3 2.0
(ARE) USERS MORE AFFLUENT/HAVE MORE SPENDING POWER	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	13 8.6
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	6 3.9
EASE OF USE/EASE/DIFFICULTY OF DEVELOPMENT	1 0.7
EASE OF LEARNING LANGUAGE/HOW FAST CAN I LEARN THE SYSTEM/ LANGUAGE	1 0.7
TIME REQUIRED/TIME TO MARKET	3 2.0

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 4

Q.1A WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY WHETHER OR NOT TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM FIRST INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
INTEGRATION/EASE/ABILITY OF ADAPTING CURRENT CODE TO DIFFERENT PLATFORMS	2 1.3
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	2 1.3
COST TO DEVELOP	2 1.3
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	5 3.3
SUPPORT/RESOURCES AVAILABLE	4 2.6
DOCUMENTATION/AVAILABILITY/ QUALITY OF DOCUMENTATION	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS AVAILABLE/WHAT IS THE SDK/API ACCESS	1 0.7
EXAMPLES/TEST ENVIRONMENTS/OTHER APPLICATIONS I COULD LOOK AT/ LEARN FROM	1 0.7
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (OF PLATFORM)/LIKE THE PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	1 0.7
PLATFORM (NET)	1 0.7
SECURITY/SECURE PLATFORM	1 0.7
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	4 2.6

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 4

Q.1A WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY WHETHER OR NOT TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM FIRST INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
FUNCTIONALITY/PURPOSE OF APPLICATION/WHAT THEY WANT IT TO DO	3 2.0
WHETHER I LIKE IT/IF IT IS AN APP THAT INTERESTS ME	1 0.7
COMPATIBILITY (NET)	2 1.3
COMPATIBILITY WITH OTHER DEVICES/ OPERATING SYSTEMS/PLATFORMS	1 0.7
OTHER COMPATIBILITY MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS	
THE NEEDS OF THE CLIENT/IT WAS MY JOB/CLIENT/COMPANY REQUESTED	2 1.3
THE ANALYTICS	1 0.7
FOURTH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	9 5.9
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	2 1.3
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	2 1.3
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	1 0.7
IS APP MARKETABLE/IS THERE A NEED/MARKET FOR IT/THE APP	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/ (CURRENT)	1
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 4

Q.1A WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY WHETHER OR NOT TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM FIRST INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	5 3.3
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	2 1.3
COST TO DEVELOP	2 1.3
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	2 1.3
DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS AVAILABLE/WHAT IS THE SDK/API ACCESS	2 1.3
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (OF PLATFORM) /LIKE THE PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS	
NUMBER OF OTHER PEOPLE DEVELOPING FOR THAT PROGRAM	2 1.3
NONE	4 2.6

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 5

Q.1B ANY OTHER FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY WHETHER TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM? (FIFTH-SEVENTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
FIFTH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	37 24.3
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	11 7.2
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	11 7.2
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB- SUBNET)	2 1.3
THE REMUNERATION/WAS ABLE TO MAKE MONEY/GET PAID	1 0.7
OTHER ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS MENTIONS	1 0.7
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	5 3.3
ADOPTION RATE	1 0.7
PROJECTED MARKET SHARE/FUTURE OF PLATFORM	2 1.3
WHERE DOES IT FIT IN THE CURRENT MARKET/TO SEE WHAT'S ALREADY IN THE MARKET/IS THIS A NEW APP/IDEA	2 1.3
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/ (CURRENT)	4
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	2.6
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE (NET)	1 0.7
OTHER DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	15 9.9

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 5

Q.1B ANY OTHER FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY WHETHER TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM? (FIFTH-SEVENTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	8 5.3
EASE OF USE/EASE/DIFFICULTY OF DEVELOPMENT	6 3.9
EASE OF LEARNING LANGUAGE/HOW FAST CAN I LEARN THE SYSTEM/ LANGUAGE	1 0.7
TIME REQUIRED/TIME TO MARKET	1 0.7
INTEGRATION/EASE/ABILITY OF ADAPTING CURRENT CODE TO DIFFERENT PLATFORMS	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	3 2.0
COST TO DEVELOP	2 1.3
(IS IT) FREE/NO COST FOR TOOL/ LICENSE	1 0.7
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	3 2.0
DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT/IS IT ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS AVAILABLE/WHAT IS THE SDK/API ACCESS	2 1.3
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (OF PLATFORM)/LIKE THE PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 5

Q.1B ANY OTHER FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY WHETHER TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM? (FIFTH-SEVENTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
PLATFORM (NET)	3 2.0
OPERATING SYSTEM OF PLATFORM	1 0.7
SECURITY/SECURE PLATFORM	2 1.3
DEVICE RELATED (NET)	2 1.3
FEATURES OF DEVICE: RESOLUTION, SPEAKERS, ETC.	2 1.3
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	4 2.6
(UNDERSTANDING) THE APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS	2 1.3
WHETHER I LIKE IT/IF IT IS AN APP THAT INTERESTS ME	1 0.7
USER INTERFACE (UI)/EXPERIENCE	1 0.7
COMPATIBILITY (NET)	2 1.3
COMPATIBILITY WITH OTHER DEVICES/ OPERATING SYSTEMS/PLATFORMS	2 1.3
MISCELLANEOUS	
THE NEEDS OF THE CLIENT/IT WAS MY JOB/CLIENT/COMPANY REQUESTED	1 0.7
NUMBER OF OTHER PEOPLE DEVELOPING FOR THAT PROGRAM	1 0.7
SIXTH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	6 3.9

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 5

Q.1B ANY OTHER FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY WHETHER TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM? (FIFTH-SEVENTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	1 0.7
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	3 2.0
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	1 0.7
TIME REQUIRED/TIME TO MARKET	1 0.7
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	1 0.7
SUPPORT/RESOURCES AVAILABLE	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	
AVAILABILITY OF DEVELOPERS TO WORK ON PLATFORM/PROJECT	1 0.7
DEVICE RELATED (NET)	1 0.7
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	1 0.7
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	1 0.7
FUNCTIONALITY/PURPOSE OF APPLICATION/WHAT THEY WANT IT TO DO	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 5

Q.1B ANY OTHER FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY WHETHER TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM? (FIFTH-SEVENTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MISCELLANEOUS	
NUMBER OF OTHER PEOPLE DEVELOPING FOR THAT PROGRAM	1 0.7
SEVENTH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	2 1.3
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE (NET)	1 0.7
TARGET MARKET/DEMOGRAPHIC/WHO IS THE AUDIENCE/CUSTOMER	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	1 0.7
COST TO DEVELOP	1 0.7
NONE	115 75.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 6

Q.1A/1B TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY
WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MENTIONED A FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	148 97.4
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	114 75.0
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	113 74.3
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB- SUBNET)	13 8.6
THE REMUNERATION/WAS ABLE TO MAKE MONEY/GET PAID	3 2.0
PROFITABILITY/RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI)	6 3.9
OTHER ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS MENTIONS	4 2.6
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	38 25.0
ADOPTION RATE	5 3.3
PROJECTED MARKET SHARE/FUTURE OF PLATFORM	13 8.6
MARKET SHARE WAS GROWING/ BECOMING MORE POPULAR/THEY WERE CAPTURING THE MARKET	4 2.6
IS APP MARKETABLE/IS THERE A NEED/MARKET FOR IT/THE APP	5 3.3
WHERE DOES IT FIT IN THE CURRENT MARKET/TO SEE WHAT'S ALREADY IN THE MARKET/IS THIS A NEW APP/IDEA	8 5.3
THE GROWTH OF MOBILE APPLICATIONS/WANTED TO GET INTO THE GROWING MOBILE MARKET	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 6

Q.1A/1B TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY
WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
THE MARKETPLACE/MARKET CONSIDERATIONS (UNSPEC)	4 2.6
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	3 2.0
WHAT COMPANY IS BEHIND THE PLATFORM	1 0.7
(LIKE) THE COMPANY/BRAND (APPLE, GOOGLE, ETC)	2 1.3
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/(CURRENT)	87
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	57.2
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	2 1.3
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/POPULARITY/RETURN	
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS USER BASE/ MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/POPULARITY/ RETURN MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE (NET)	9 5.9
TARGET MARKET/DEMOGRAPHIC/WHO IS THE AUDIENCE/CUSTOMER	6 3.9
(ARE) USERS MORE AFFLUENT/HAVE MORE SPENDING POWER	2 1.3
OTHER DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE MENTIONS	2 1.3
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	78 51.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 6

Q.1A/1B TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY
WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	41 27.0
EASE OF USE/EASE/DIFFICULTY OF DEVELOPMENT	27 17.8
EASE OF LEARNING LANGUAGE/HOW FAST CAN I LEARN THE SYSTEM/ LANGUAGE	8 5.3
TIME REQUIRED/TIME TO MARKET	9 5.9
INTEGRATION/EASE/ABILITY OF ADAPTING CURRENT CODE TO DIFFERENT PLATFORMS	7 4.6
OTHER TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	17 11.2
COST TO DEVELOP	14 9.2
COST OF DEVELOPMENT TOOLS/FEEES REQUIRED TO DEVELOP FOR THAT PROGRAM	2 1.3
(IS IT) FREE/NO COST FOR TOOL/ LICENSE	1 0.7
OTHER DEVELOPMENT COSTS MENTIONS	1 0.7
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	29 19.1
SUPPORT/RESOURCES AVAILABLE	8 5.3
DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT/IS IT ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY	3 2.0

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 6

Q.1A/1B TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY
WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DOCUMENTATION/AVAILABILITY/ QUALITY OF DOCUMENTATION	4 2.6
DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS AVAILABLE/WHAT IS THE SDK/API ACCESS	11 7.2
FRAMEWORK/IS THERE A FRAMEWORK AVAILABLE TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS	4 2.6
EXAMPLES/TEST ENVIRONMENTS/OTHER APPLICATIONS I COULD LOOK AT/ LEARN FROM	2 1.3
OTHER SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT MENTIONS	1 0.7
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	10 6.6
FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/ LANGUAGE (SUB-SUBNET)	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/LANGUAGE	
HAD EXPOSURE TO IT ALREADY/ ALREADY KNEW THE LANGUAGE/ BUILT ON A LANGUAGE I ALREADY KNEW	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (OF PLATFORM)/LIKE THE PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	9 5.9
MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	
AVAILABILITY OF DEVELOPERS TO WORK ON PLATFORM/PROJECT	4 2.6
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES MENTIONS	2 1.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 6

Q.1A/1B TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY
WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
PLATFORM (NET)	14 9.2
THE PLATFORM/WHAT PLATFORM IT'S BUILT ON	2 1.3
OPERATING SYSTEM OF PLATFORM	4 2.6
(IS) PLATFORM OPEN/IS IT OPEN- SOURCE	1 0.7
CAPABILITIES OF PLATFORM	2 1.3
SECURITY/SECURE PLATFORM	4 2.6
OTHER PLATFORM MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEVICE RELATED (NET)	10 6.6
HAVE/LIKE THE DEVICE (I HAVE AN IPHONE, FAN OF ANDROID PHONES)	1 0.7
WHAT DEVICES THE PLATFORM WAS ON	1 0.7
FEATURES OF DEVICE: RESOLUTION, SPEAKERS, ETC.	6 3.9
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	2 1.3
COMMITMENT TO PROJECT (NET)	3 2.0
MARKETING PLANS/HOW WILL IT BE MARKETED	1 0.7
(WHETHER) COMPANY IS/WAS BEHIND PROJECT/PRODUCT	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 6

Q.1A/1B TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY
WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
APP STORE/INTERFACE FOR SELLING APP	1 0.7
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	20 13.2
(UNDERSTANDING) THE APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS	3 2.0
FUNCTIONALITY/PURPOSE OF APPLICATION/WHAT THEY WANT IT TO DO	8 5.3
WHETHER I LIKE IT/IF IT IS AN APP THAT INTERESTS ME	2 1.3
USER INTERFACE (UI)/EXPERIENCE	8 5.3
COMPATIBILITY (NET)	7 4.6
COMPATIBILITY WITH OTHER DEVICES/ OPERATING SYSTEMS/PLATFORMS	4 2.6
OTHER COMPATIBILITY MENTIONS	3 2.0
MISCELLANEOUS	
THE NEEDS OF THE CLIENT/IT WAS MY JOB/CLIENT/COMPANY REQUESTED	6 3.9
NUMBER OF JOBS AVAILABLE DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS ON THAT PLATFORM	1 0.7
NUMBER OF OTHER PEOPLE DEVELOPING FOR THAT PROGRAM	5 3.3
THE TECHNOLOGY/TECHNOLOGICAL POTENTIAL	3 2.0
THE ANALYTICS	2 1.3
SCALABILITY	2 1.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 6

Q.1A/1B TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT WILL INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TODAY
WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THIS PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
IS IT LEGAL/ARE THEIR COPYRIGHT ISSUES	1 0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS MENTIONS	5 3.3
NONE	4 2.6

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 7

Q.2A WHICH ONE OF THE FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS YOU MENTIONED WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT IN YOUR DECISION
WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM THAT WAS INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MENTIONED A FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION IN Q.1A/B	148 97.4
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	95 62.5
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	94 61.8
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB- SUBNET)	6 3.9
THE REMUNERATION/WAS ABLE TO MAKE MONEY/GET PAID	3 2.0
PROFITABILITY/RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI)	3 2.0
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	22 14.5
ADOPTION RATE	3 2.0
PROJECTED MARKET SHARE/FUTURE OF PLATFORM	8 5.3
MARKET SHARE WAS GROWING/ BECOMING MORE POPULAR/THEY WERE CAPTURING THE MARKET	3 2.0
IS APP MARKETABLE/IS THERE A NEED/MARKET FOR IT/THE APP	4 2.6
WHERE DOES IT FIT IN THE CURRENT MARKET/TO SEE WHAT'S ALREADY IN THE MARKET/IS THIS A NEW APP/IDEA	3 2.0
THE GROWTH OF MOBILE APPLICATIONS/WANTED TO GET INTO THE GROWING MOBILE MARKET	1 0.7
THE MARKETPLACE/MARKET CONSIDERATIONS (UNSPEC)	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 7

Q.2A WHICH ONE OF THE FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS YOU MENTIONED WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM THAT WAS INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	1 0.7
(LIKE) THE COMPANY/BRAND (APPLE, GOOGLE, ETC)	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/ (CURRENT)	64
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	42.1
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	1 0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/POPULARITY/RETURN	
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS USER BASE/ MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/POPULARITY/ RETURN MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE (NET)	5 3.3
TARGET MARKET/DEMOGRAPHIC/WHO IS THE AUDIENCE/CUSTOMER	3 2.0
(ARE) USERS MORE AFFLUENT/HAVE MORE SPENDING POWER	2 1.3
OTHER DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	27 17.8
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	7 4.6
EASE OF USE/EASE/DIFFICULTY OF DEVELOPMENT	2 1.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 7

Q.2A WHICH ONE OF THE FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS YOU MENTIONED WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT IN YOUR DECISION
WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM THAT WAS INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
EASE OF LEARNING LANGUAGE/HOW FAST CAN I LEARN THE SYSTEM/ LANGUAGE	4 2.6
INTEGRATION/EASE/ABILITY OF ADAPTING CURRENT CODE TO DIFFERENT PLATFORMS	2 1.3
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	2 1.3
COST TO DEVELOP	2 1.3
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	13 8.6
SUPPORT/RESOURCES AVAILABLE	2 1.3
DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT/IS IT ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY	1 0.7
DOCUMENTATION/AVAILABILITY/ QUALITY OF DOCUMENTATION	3 2.0
DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS AVAILABLE/WHAT IS THE SDK/API ACCESS	5 3.3
FRAMEWORK/IS THERE A FRAMEWORK AVAILABLE TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS	2 1.3
EXAMPLES/TEST ENVIRONMENTS/OTHER APPLICATIONS I COULD LOOK AT/ LEARN FROM	1 0.7
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	4 2.6
MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (OF PLATFORM)/LIKE THE PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	4 2.6

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 7

Q.2A WHICH ONE OF THE FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS YOU MENTIONED WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT IN YOUR DECISION
WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM THAT WAS INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES MENTIONS	1 0.7
PLATFORM (NET)	8 5.3
THE PLATFORM/WHAT PLATFORM IT'S BUILT ON	1 0.7
OPERATING SYSTEM OF PLATFORM	3 2.0
CAPABILITIES OF PLATFORM	2 1.3
SECURITY/SECURE PLATFORM	2 1.3
DEVICE RELATED (NET)	3 2.0
FEATURES OF DEVICE: RESOLUTION, SPEAKERS, ETC.	2 1.3
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	1 0.7
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	8 5.3
(UNDERSTANDING) THE APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS	2 1.3
FUNCTIONALITY/PURPOSE OF APPLICATION/WHAT THEY WANT IT TO DO	2 1.3
USER INTERFACE (UI)/EXPERIENCE	4 2.6
COMPATIBILITY (NET)	2 1.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 7

Q.2A WHICH ONE OF THE FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS YOU MENTIONED WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT IN YOUR DECISION
WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM THAT WAS INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
COMPATIBILITY WITH OTHER DEVICES/ OPERATING SYSTEMS/PLATFORMS	1 0.7
OTHER COMPATIBILITY MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS	
THE NEEDS OF THE CLIENT/IT WAS MY JOB/CLIENT/COMPANY REQUESTED	4 2.6
NUMBER OF JOBS AVAILABLE DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS ON THAT PLATFORM	1 0.7
NUMBER OF OTHER PEOPLE DEVELOPING FOR THAT PROGRAM	1 0.7
THE ANALYTICS	1 0.7
IS IT LEGAL/ARE THEIR COPYRIGHT ISSUES	1 0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS MENTIONS	2 1.3
DID NOT MENTION A FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION IN Q.1A/B	4 2.6

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 8

Q.2B/2C WHAT MAKES YOU SAY THAT (ANSWER FROM Q2A) WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION
IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MENTIONED A FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION IN Q.1A/B	148 97.4
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	90 59.2
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	62 40.8
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB- SUBNET)	37 24.3
RETURN ON INVESTMENT (SUB-SUB- SUBNET)	9 5.9
DETERMINES/ENSURES RETURN ON INVESTMENT/KNOWING YOU WILL RECOUP/NOT LOSE YOUR MONEY	7 4.6
WOULD WANT THE MOST BANG FOR YOUR BUCK/LARGEST RETURN	2 1.3
MISCELLANEOUS ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS	
FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS/IT MUST MAKE FINANCIAL SENSE (UNSPEC)	4 2.6
PROFITABILITY/WANT TO MAKE MONEY/THE PRODUCT MUST MAKE MONEY	13 8.6
DETERMINES HOW MUCH MONEY YOU MAKE/WOULD WANT LARGER PROFITS/TO MAKE MORE MONEY	7 4.6
DETERMINES/GENERATES (MORE) BUSINESS/SALES/WOULD WANT MORE SALES/DOWNLOADS	3 2.0
MY LIVELIHOOD DEPENDS ON IT/I NEED THE WORK/WANT TO CONTINUE WORKING	3 2.0
OTHER ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS MENTIONS	3 2.0

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 8

Q.2B/2C WHAT MAKES YOU SAY THAT (ANSWER FROM Q2A) WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION
IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	6
	3.9
WOULD WANT/NEED A GROWING MARKET/CUSTOMER BASE	3
	2.0
OTHER MARKET GROWTH MENTIONS	3
	2.0
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	1
	0.7
OTHER COMPANY RELATED MENTIONS	1
	0.7
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
INDICATES/DETERMINES THE POPULARITY/SIZE OF USER BASE	1
	0.7
WOULD WANT THE LARGEST AMOUNT OF USERS/TO REACH AS MANY PEOPLE AS POSSIBLE	26
	17.1
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE MENTIONS	6
	3.9
MISCELLANEOUS USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/POPULARITY/RETURN	
YOU WANT AN AUDIENCE/USER BASE/NO USE CREATING AN APPLICATION IF NO ONE WOULD USE IT/BUY IT	27
	17.8
WE BUILD APPS FOR THE USERS/ CUSTOMERS	5
	3.3
NEED TO SUPPORT (ANY) PLATFORMS THAT CUSTOMERS USE	3
	2.0
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS USER BASE/ MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/POPULARITY/ RETURN MENTIONS	8
	5.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 8

Q.2B/2C WHAT MAKES YOU SAY THAT (ANSWER FROM Q2A) WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION
IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	37 24.3
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	19 12.5
TIME OF DEVELOPMENT (SUB-SUBNET)	10 6.6
DETERMINES THE TIME IT TAKES/ HOW FAST WE CAN WORK/DEVELOP THE APPLICATION	7 4.6
IT TAKES TIME TO DEVELOP/ CONCERNED ABOUT THE TIME I'M INVESTING	2 1.3
OTHER TIME OF DEVELOPMENT MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT	
DETERMINES THE EFFORT INVOLVED/ WOULD WANT IT TO BE EASY TO USE/DEVELOP	3 2.0
PROGRAMMING/DEVELOPMENT IS IMPOSSIBLE/TOO DIFFICULT WITHOUT IT	1 0.7
EASIER IF THE PLATFORM/LANGUAGE IS SIMILAR TO WHAT WE ALREADY WORK WITH	1 0.7
SOME PLATFORMS/FRAMEWORKS ARE HORRIBLE TO USE/WRITE FOR	2 1.3
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT MENTIONS	4 2.6
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	9 5.9

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 8

Q.2B/2C WHAT MAKES YOU SAY THAT (ANSWER FROM Q2A) WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION
IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
CONCERNED ABOUT THE COSTS/COST OF DEVELOPMENT RUNNING HIGH (UNSPEC)	3 2.0
CONCERNED ABOUT THE BUDGET/NEED TO DEVELOP WITHIN BUDGET	1 0.7
HAVE LIMITED RESOURCES (FOR DEVELOPMENT)	1 0.7
OTHER DEVELOPMENT COSTS MENTIONS	4 2.6
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	6 3.9
IMPORTANT TO HAVE/NEED GOOD DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS	1 0.7
NEED A GOOD/FRIENDLY INFRASTRUCTURE/SUPPORT ENVIRONMENT	1 0.7
OTHER SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT MENTIONS	4 2.6
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	11 7.2
FAMILIARITY WITH THE PLATFORM/ LANGUAGE/PREFER TO USE A LANGUAGE I ALREADY KNOW	4 2.6
DETERMINES/NEED TO KNOW WHICH (NEW) LANGUAGES/PLATFORMS I HAVE TO LEARN/KEEP UP WITH	2 1.3
WOULD WANT TO REUSE EXISTING CODE (RATHER THAN WRITING FROM SCRATCH)	3 2.0
OTHER PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE MENTIONS	5 3.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 8

Q.2B/2C WHAT MAKES YOU SAY THAT (ANSWER FROM Q2A) WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION
IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT	3
ISSUES MENTIONS	2.0
PLATFORM (NET)	14
	9.2
I LIKE/AM SATISFIED WITH OTHER	7
PLATFORM/OS/WHAT I USE NOW:	4.6
ANDROID, APPLE/IOS	
DON'T (USUALLY) DEVELOP FOR	3
MICROSOFT/WINDOWS	2.0
DON'T (USUALLY) DEVELOP FOR	3
BLACKBERRY	2.0
WANT/EXPECT GOOD PERFORMANCE FROM	1
PLATFORM: SPEED, STABILITY, ETC.	0.7
OTHER PLATFORM MENTIONS	3
	2.0
COMMITMENT TO PROJECT (NET)	4
	2.6
DETERMINES INVESTMENT/FUNDING FOR	3
THE PROJECT/WOULD NEED CLIENT/	2.0
COMPANY INVESTMENT	
OTHER COMMITMENT TO PROJECT	1
MENTIONS	0.7
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	18
	11.8
FUNCTIONALITY (SUBNET)	4
	2.6
EFFECTS/DETERMINES THE	3
FUNCTIONALITY OF THE APPLICATION	2.0

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 8

Q.2B/2C WHAT MAKES YOU SAY THAT (ANSWER FROM Q2A) WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION
IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MENTIONS OF SPECIFIC APPLICATIONS/FUNCTIONALITIES BEING DEVELOPED	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION SPECIFIC	
APPLICATION NEEDS TO BE USABLE/ OTHERWISE PEOPLE COULDN'T USE THE APP	3 2.0
WOULD WANT APPLICATION TO SERVE A NEED/BE USEFUL/BENEFIT USERS	5 3.3
WOULD WANT APP TO BE EASY FOR CUSTOMERS TO USE/LEARN	1 0.7
(FOR THE) USER INTERFACE/ EXPERIENCE	2 1.3
OTHER APPLICATION SPECIFIC MENTIONS	4 2.6
COMPATIBILITY (NET)	11 7.2
WOULD WANT IT TO RUN ON MULTIPLE DEVICES/PLATFORMS	2 1.3
NEEDS TO BE MOBILE COMPATIBLE/RUN ON MOBILE DEVICES (AS WELL AS DESKTOP)	3 2.0
OTHER COMPATIBILITY MENTIONS	6 3.9
MISCELLANEOUS	
IT'S IMPORTANT/NECESSARY (UNSPEC)	5 3.3
MAKES IT WORTHWHILE/OTHERWISE IT WOULD BE A WASTE OF TIME	19 12.5
DETERMINES IT'S SUCCESS/VIABILITY/ SUSTAINABILITY	2 1.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 8

Q.2B/2C WHAT MAKES YOU SAY THAT (ANSWER FROM Q2A) WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION
IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
PROBLEMS WITH HACKERS/IDENTITY	2
THEFT/DATA BREACHES	1.3
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR/SELL TO	6
CLIENTS/NEED TO SATISFY OUR CLIENTS	3.9
CONCERNED WITH THE TECHNOLOGY BEING	2
USED/IF IT'S NEW TECHNOLOGY	1.3
IT'S A COMPETITIVE MARKET/USERS	2
HAVE MANY OPTIONS	1.3
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS MENTIONS	3
	2.0
DID NOT MENTION A FACTOR OR	4
CONSIDERATION IN Q.1A/B	2.6

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 9

Q.3A WHICH ONE OF THE FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT YOU MENTIONED WILL BE THE SECOND MOST IMPORTANT
IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MENTIONED AT LEAST TWO FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS IN Q.1A/B	106 69.7
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	42 27.6
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	42 27.6
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB- SUBNET)	4 2.6
PROFITABILITY/RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI)	2 1.3
OTHER ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS MENTIONS	2 1.3
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	12 7.9
ADOPTION RATE	2 1.3
PROJECTED MARKET SHARE/FUTURE OF PLATFORM	3 2.0
IS APP MARKETABLE/IS THERE A NEED/MARKET FOR IT/THE APP	2 1.3
WHERE DOES IT FIT IN THE CURRENT MARKET/TO SEE WHAT'S ALREADY IN THE MARKET/IS THIS A NEW APP/IDEA	3 2.0
THE MARKETPLACE/MARKET CONSIDERATIONS (UNSPEC)	2 1.3
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	2 1.3
WHAT COMPANY IS BEHIND THE PLATFORM	1 0.7
(LIKE) THE COMPANY/BRAND (APPLE, GOOGLE, ETC)	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 9

Q.3A WHICH ONE OF THE FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT YOU MENTIONED WILL BE THE SECOND MOST IMPORTANT
IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/ (CURRENT)	24
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	15.8
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE (NET)	2 1.3
TARGET MARKET/DEMOGRAPHIC/WHO IS THE AUDIENCE/CUSTOMER	1 0.7
OTHER DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	41 27.0
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	18 11.8
EASE OF USE/EASE/DIFFICULTY OF DEVELOPMENT	14 9.2
EASE OF LEARNING LANGUAGE/HOW FAST CAN I LEARN THE SYSTEM/ LANGUAGE	1 0.7
TIME REQUIRED/TIME TO MARKET	2 1.3
INTEGRATION/EASE/ABILITY OF ADAPTING CURRENT CODE TO DIFFERENT PLATFORMS	2 1.3
OTHER TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	11 7.2
COST TO DEVELOP	8 5.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 9

Q.3A WHICH ONE OF THE FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT YOU MENTIONED WILL BE THE SECOND MOST IMPORTANT
IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
COST OF DEVELOPMENT TOOLS/FEES REQUIRED TO DEVELOP FOR THAT PROGRAM	2 1.3
OTHER DEVELOPMENT COSTS MENTIONS	1 0.7
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	10 6.6
SUPPORT/RESOURCES AVAILABLE	3 2.0
DOCUMENTATION/AVAILABILITY/ QUALITY OF DOCUMENTATION	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS AVAILABLE/WHAT IS THE SDK/API ACCESS	5 3.3
FRAMEWORK/IS THERE A FRAMEWORK AVAILABLE TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS	1 0.7
EXAMPLES/TEST ENVIRONMENTS/OTHER APPLICATIONS I COULD LOOK AT/ LEARN FROM	1 0.7
OTHER SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT MENTIONS	1 0.7
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	2 1.3
FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/ LANGUAGE (SUB-SUBNET)	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/LANGUAGE	
HAD EXPOSURE TO IT ALREADY/ ALREADY KNEW THE LANGUAGE/ BUILT ON A LANGUAGE I ALREADY KNEW	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 9

Q.3A WHICH ONE OF THE FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT YOU MENTIONED WILL BE THE SECOND MOST IMPORTANT
IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (OF	1
PLATFORM)/LIKE THE PROGRAMMING	0.7
LANGUAGE	
MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	
AVAILABILITY OF DEVELOPERS TO	1
WORK ON PLATFORM/PROJECT	0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT	1
ISSUES MENTIONS	0.7
PLATFORM (NET)	3
	2.0
(IS) PLATFORM OPEN/IS IT OPEN-	1
SOURCE	0.7
SECURITY/SECURE PLATFORM	1
	0.7
OTHER PLATFORM MENTIONS	1
	0.7
DEVICE RELATED (NET)	3
	2.0
WHAT DEVICES THE PLATFORM WAS ON	1
	0.7
FEATURES OF DEVICE: RESOLUTION,	2
SPEAKERS, ETC.	1.3
COMMITMENT TO PROJECT (NET)	3
	2.0
MARKETING PLANS/HOW WILL IT BE	1
MARKETED	0.7
(WHETHER) COMPANY IS/WAS BEHIND	1
PROJECT/PRODUCT	0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 9

Q.3A WHICH ONE OF THE FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT YOU MENTIONED WILL BE THE SECOND MOST IMPORTANT
IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
APP STORE/INTERFACE FOR SELLING APP	1 0.7
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	8 5.3
(UNDERSTANDING) THE APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS	1 0.7
FUNCTIONALITY/PURPOSE OF APPLICATION/WHAT THEY WANT IT TO DO	2 1.3
USER INTERFACE (UI)/EXPERIENCE	5 3.3
COMPATIBILITY (NET)	3 2.0
COMPATIBILITY WITH OTHER DEVICES/ OPERATING SYSTEMS/PLATFORMS	1 0.7
OTHER COMPATIBILITY MENTIONS	2 1.3
MISCELLANEOUS	
THE NEEDS OF THE CLIENT/IT WAS MY JOB/CLIENT/COMPANY REQUESTED	1 0.7
NUMBER OF OTHER PEOPLE DEVELOPING FOR THAT PROGRAM	1 0.7
THE TECHNOLOGY/TECHNOLOGICAL POTENTIAL	1 0.7
SCALABILITY	1 0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS MENTIONS	1 0.7
DID NOT MENTION AT LEAST TWO FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS IN Q.1A/B	46 30.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 10

Q.3B/3C WHAT MAKES YOU SAY THAT (ANSWER FROM Q3A) WILL BE THE SECOND MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION
IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MENTIONED AT LEAST TWO FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS IN Q.1A/B	106 69.7
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	45 29.6
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	36 23.7
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB- SUBNET)	19 12.5
RETURN ON INVESTMENT (SUB-SUB- SUBNET)	2 1.3
DETERMINES/ENSURES RETURN ON INVESTMENT/KNOWING YOU WILL RECOUP/NOT LOSE YOUR MONEY	2 1.3
MISCELLANEOUS ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS	
PROFITABILITY/WANT TO MAKE MONEY/THE PRODUCT MUST MAKE MONEY	7 4.6
DETERMINES HOW MUCH MONEY YOU MAKE/WOULD WANT LARGER PROFITS/TO MAKE MORE MONEY	4 2.6
DETERMINES/GENERATES (MORE) BUSINESS/SALES/WOULD WANT MORE SALES/DOWNLOADS	4 2.6
DETERMINES HOW FAST YOU MAKE MONEY	2 1.3
OTHER ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS MENTIONS	1 0.7
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	1 0.7
OTHER MARKET GROWTH MENTIONS	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 10

Q.3B/3C WHAT MAKES YOU SAY THAT (ANSWER FROM Q3A) WILL BE THE SECOND MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION
IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	5 3.3
OTHER COMPANY RELATED MENTIONS	5 3.3
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
INDICATES/DETERMINES THE POPULARITY/SIZE OF USER BASE	3 2.0
WOULD WANT THE LARGEST AMOUNT OF USERS/TO REACH AS MANY PEOPLE AS POSSIBLE	10 6.6
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE MENTIONS	2 1.3
MISCELLANEOUS USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/POPULARITY/RETURN	
YOU WANT AN AUDIENCE/USER BASE/NO USE CREATING AN APPLICATION IF NO ONE WOULD USE IT/BUY IT	12 7.9
NEED TO SUPPORT (ANY) PLATFORMS THAT CUSTOMERS USE	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	38 25.0
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	16 10.5
TIME OF DEVELOPMENT (SUB-SUBNET)	6 3.9
DETERMINES THE TIME IT TAKES/ HOW FAST WE CAN WORK/DEVELOP THE APPLICATION	4 2.6
IT TAKES TIME TO DEVELOP/ CONCERNED ABOUT THE TIME I'M INVESTING	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 10

Q.3B/3C WHAT MAKES YOU SAY THAT (ANSWER FROM Q3A) WILL BE THE SECOND MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION
IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
OTHER TIME OF DEVELOPMENT MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT	
DETERMINES THE EFFORT INVOLVED/ WOULD WANT IT TO BE EASY TO USE/DEVELOP	7 4.6
PROGRAMMING/DEVELOPMENT IS IMPOSSIBLE/TOO DIFFICULT WITHOUT IT	1 0.7
EASIER IF THE PLATFORM/LANGUAGE IS SIMILAR TO WHAT WE ALREADY WORK WITH	1 0.7
SOME PLATFORMS/Frameworks ARE HORRIBLE TO USE/WRITE FOR	1 0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT MENTIONS	2 1.3
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	14 9.2
CONCERNED ABOUT THE COSTS/COST OF DEVELOPMENT RUNNING HIGH (UNSPEC)	7 4.6
CONCERNED ABOUT THE BUDGET/NEED TO DEVELOP WITHIN BUDGET	3 2.0
HAVE LIMITED RESOURCES (FOR DEVELOPMENT)	2 1.3
OTHER DEVELOPMENT COSTS MENTIONS	4 2.6
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	8 5.3
IMPORTANT TO HAVE/NEED GOOD DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS	4 2.6

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 10

Q.3B/3C WHAT MAKES YOU SAY THAT (ANSWER FROM Q3A) WILL BE THE SECOND MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION
IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
NEED A GOOD/FRIENDLY INFRASTRUCTURE/SUPPORT ENVIRONMENT	2 1.3
OTHER SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT MENTIONS	4 2.6
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	5 3.3
FAMILIARITY WITH THE PLATFORM/ LANGUAGE/PREFER TO USE A LANGUAGE I ALREADY KNOW	1 0.7
DETERMINES/NEED TO KNOW WHICH (NEW) LANGUAGES/PLATFORMS I HAVE TO LEARN/KEEP UP WITH	1 0.7
OTHER PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE MENTIONS	3 2.0
MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	
DETERMINES HOW MANY QUALIFIED DEVELOPERS ARE AVAILABLE/HOW EASY IT IS TO FIND THEM	2 1.3
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES MENTIONS	4 2.6
PLATFORM (NET)	9 5.9
I LIKE/AM SATISFIED WITH OTHER PLATFORM/OS/WHAT I USE NOW: ANDROID, APPLE/IOS	3 2.0
WANT/EXPECT GOOD PERFORMANCE FROM PLATFORM: SPEED, STABILITY, ETC.	3 2.0
OTHER PLATFORM MENTIONS	4 2.6
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	19 12.5

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 10

Q.3B/3C WHAT MAKES YOU SAY THAT (ANSWER FROM Q3A) WILL BE THE SECOND MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION
IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
FUNCTIONALITY (SUBNET)	6 3.9
EFFECTS/DETERMINES THE FUNCTIONALITY OF THE APPLICATION	1 0.7
NEED/WANT TO IMPROVE/UPGRADE APPLICATIONS/ADD ADDITIONAL FEATURES/FUNCTIONALITY	3 2.0
MENTIONS OF SPECIFIC APPLICATIONS/FUNCTIONALITIES BEING DEVELOPED	1 0.7
OTHER FUNCTIONALITY MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION SPECIFIC	
APPLICATION NEEDS TO BE USABLE/ OTHERWISE PEOPLE COULDN'T USE THE APP	3 2.0
WOULD WANT APPLICATION TO SERVE A NEED/BE USEFUL/BENEFIT USERS	4 2.6
WOULD WANT APP TO BE EASY FOR CUSTOMERS TO USE/LEARN	5 3.3
(FOR THE) USER INTERFACE/ EXPERIENCE	1 0.7
OTHER APPLICATION SPECIFIC MENTIONS	4 2.6
COMPATIBILITY (NET)	4 2.6
WOULD WANT IT TO RUN ON MULTIPLE DEVICES/PLATFORMS	2 1.3
NEEDS TO BE MOBILE COMPATIBLE/RUN ON MOBILE DEVICES (AS WELL AS DESKTOP)	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 10

Q.3B/3C WHAT MAKES YOU SAY THAT (ANSWER FROM Q3A) WILL BE THE SECOND MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION
IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
OTHER COMPATIBILITY MENTIONS	2 1.3
MISCELLANEOUS	
IT'S IMPORTANT/NECESSARY (UNSPEC)	4 2.6
BASED ON MY EXPERIENCE	2 1.3
MAKES IT WORTHWHILE/OTHERWISE IT WOULD BE A WASTE OF TIME	3 2.0
DETERMINES IT'S SUCCESS/VIABILITY/ SUSTAINABILITY	7 4.6
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR/SELL TO CLIENTS/NEED TO SATISFY OUR CLIENTS	4 2.6
WOULD/MIGHT NEED TO SCALE UP/HIRE MORE PEOPLE/DEVELOPERS	6 3.9
IT'S A COMPETITIVE MARKET/USERS HAVE MANY OPTIONS	2 1.3
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS MENTIONS	4 2.6
NON-RESPONSIVE ANSWER	1 0.7
DID NOT MENTION AT LEAST TWO FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS IN Q.1A/B	46 30.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 11

NET OF Q.2A/3A FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS YOU MENTIONED WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT/SECOND MOST IMPORTANT IN YOUR
DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM THAT WAS INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MENTIONED A FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION IN Q.1A/B	148 97.4
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	112 73.7
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	111 73.0
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB- SUBNET)	10 6.6
THE REMUNERATION/WAS ABLE TO MAKE MONEY/GET PAID	3 2.0
PROFITABILITY/RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI)	5 3.3
OTHER ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS MENTIONS	2 1.3
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	33 21.7
ADOPTION RATE	5 3.3
PROJECTED MARKET SHARE/FUTURE OF PLATFORM	11 7.2
MARKET SHARE WAS GROWING/ BECOMING MORE POPULAR/THEY WERE CAPTURING THE MARKET	3 2.0
IS APP MARKETABLE/IS THERE A NEED/MARKET FOR IT/THE APP	5 3.3
WHERE DOES IT FIT IN THE CURRENT MARKET/TO SEE WHAT'S ALREADY IN THE MARKET/IS THIS A NEW APP/IDEA	6 3.9
THE GROWTH OF MOBILE APPLICATIONS/WANTED TO GET INTO THE GROWING MOBILE MARKET	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 11

NET OF Q.2A/3A FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS YOU MENTIONED WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT/SECOND MOST IMPORTANT IN YOUR
DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM THAT WAS INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
THE MARKETPLACE/MARKET CONSIDERATIONS (UNSPEC)	3 2.0
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	3 2.0
WHAT COMPANY IS BEHIND THE PLATFORM	1 0.7
(LIKE) THE COMPANY/BRAND (APPLE, GOOGLE, ETC)	2 1.3
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/(CURRENT)	84
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	55.3
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	1 0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/POPULARITY/RETURN	
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS USER BASE/ MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/POPULARITY/ RETURN MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE (NET)	7 4.6
TARGET MARKET/DEMOGRAPHIC/WHO IS THE AUDIENCE/CUSTOMER	4 2.6
(ARE) USERS MORE AFFLUENT/HAVE MORE SPENDING POWER	2 1.3
OTHER DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE MENTIONS	2 1.3
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	61 40.1

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 11

NET OF Q.2A/3A FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS YOU MENTIONED WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT/SECOND MOST IMPORTANT IN YOUR
DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM THAT WAS INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	25 16.4
EASE OF USE/EASE/DIFFICULTY OF DEVELOPMENT	16 10.5
EASE OF LEARNING LANGUAGE/HOW FAST CAN I LEARN THE SYSTEM/ LANGUAGE	5 3.3
TIME REQUIRED/TIME TO MARKET	2 1.3
INTEGRATION/EASE/ABILITY OF ADAPTING CURRENT CODE TO DIFFERENT PLATFORMS	4 2.6
OTHER TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	13 8.6
COST TO DEVELOP	10 6.6
COST OF DEVELOPMENT TOOLS/FEEES REQUIRED TO DEVELOP FOR THAT PROGRAM	2 1.3
OTHER DEVELOPMENT COSTS MENTIONS	1 0.7
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	23 15.1
SUPPORT/RESOURCES AVAILABLE	5 3.3
DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT/IS IT ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY	1 0.7
DOCUMENTATION/AVAILABILITY/ QUALITY OF DOCUMENTATION	4 2.6

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 11

NET OF Q.2A/3A FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS YOU MENTIONED WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT/SECOND MOST IMPORTANT IN YOUR
DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM THAT WAS INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS AVAILABLE/WHAT IS THE SDK/API ACCESS	10 6.6
FRAMEWORK/IS THERE A FRAMEWORK AVAILABLE TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS	3 2.0
EXAMPLES/TEST ENVIRONMENTS/OTHER APPLICATIONS I COULD LOOK AT/ LEARN FROM	2 1.3
OTHER SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT MENTIONS	1 0.7
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	6 3.9
FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/ LANGUAGE (SUB-SUBNET)	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/LANGUAGE	
HAD EXPOSURE TO IT ALREADY/ ALREADY KNEW THE LANGUAGE/ BUILT ON A LANGUAGE I ALREADY KNEW	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (OF PLATFORM)/LIKE THE PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	5 3.3
MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	
AVAILABILITY OF DEVELOPERS TO WORK ON PLATFORM/PROJECT	1 0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES MENTIONS	2 1.3
PLATFORM (NET)	11 7.2

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 11

NET OF Q.2A/3A FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS YOU MENTIONED WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT/SECOND MOST IMPORTANT IN YOUR
DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM THAT WAS INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
THE PLATFORM/WHAT PLATFORM IT'S BUILT ON	1 0.7
OPERATING SYSTEM OF PLATFORM	3 2.0
(IS) PLATFORM OPEN/IS IT OPEN- SOURCE	1 0.7
CAPABILITIES OF PLATFORM	2 1.3
SECURITY/SECURE PLATFORM	3 2.0
OTHER PLATFORM MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEVICE RELATED (NET)	5 3.3
WHAT DEVICES THE PLATFORM WAS ON	1 0.7
FEATURES OF DEVICE: RESOLUTION, SPEAKERS, ETC.	3 2.0
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	1 0.7
COMMITMENT TO PROJECT (NET)	3 2.0
MARKETING PLANS/HOW WILL IT BE MARKETED	1 0.7
(WHETHER) COMPANY IS/WAS BEHIND PROJECT/PRODUCT	1 0.7
APP STORE/INTERFACE FOR SELLING APP	1 0.7
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	15 9.9

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 11

NET OF Q.2A/3A FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS YOU MENTIONED WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT/SECOND MOST IMPORTANT IN YOUR
DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM THAT WAS INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
(UNDERSTANDING) THE APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS	3 2.0
FUNCTIONALITY/PURPOSE OF APPLICATION/WHAT THEY WANT IT TO DO	4 2.6
USER INTERFACE (UI)/EXPERIENCE	8 5.3
COMPATIBILITY (NET)	4 2.6
COMPATIBILITY WITH OTHER DEVICES/OPERATING SYSTEMS/PLATFORMS	2 1.3
OTHER COMPATIBILITY MENTIONS	2 1.3
MISCELLANEOUS	
THE NEEDS OF THE CLIENT/IT WAS MY JOB/CLIENT/COMPANY REQUESTED	5 3.3
NUMBER OF JOBS AVAILABLE DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS ON THAT PLATFORM	1 0.7
NUMBER OF OTHER PEOPLE DEVELOPING FOR THAT PROGRAM	2 1.3
THE TECHNOLOGY/TECHNOLOGICAL POTENTIAL	1 0.7
THE ANALYTICS	1 0.7
SCALABILITY	1 0.7
IS IT LEGAL/ARE THEIR COPYRIGHT ISSUES	1 0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS MENTIONS	3 2.0

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 11

NET OF Q.2A/3A FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS YOU MENTIONED WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT/SECOND MOST IMPORTANT IN YOUR
DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM THAT WAS INTRODUCED TWO YEARS AGO?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DID NOT MENTION A FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION IN Q.1A/B	4 2.6

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 12

NET OF Q.2B/2C/3B/3C WHAT MAKES YOU SAY THAT (ANSWER FROM Q2A/3A) WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT/2ND MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MENTIONED A FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION IN Q.1A/B	148 97.4
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	113 74.3
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	82 53.9
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB-SUBNET)	49 32.2
RETURN ON INVESTMENT (SUB-SUB-SUBNET)	11 7.2
DETERMINES/ENSURES RETURN ON INVESTMENT/KNOWING YOU WILL RECOUP/NOT LOSE YOUR MONEY	9 5.9
WOULD WANT THE MOST BANG FOR YOUR BUCK/LARGEST RETURN	2 1.3
MISCELLANEOUS ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS	
FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS/IT MUST MAKE FINANCIAL SENSE (UNSPEC)	4 2.6
PROFITABILITY/WANT TO MAKE MONEY/THE PRODUCT MUST MAKE MONEY	18 11.8
DETERMINES HOW MUCH MONEY YOU MAKE/WOULD WANT LARGER PROFITS/TO MAKE MORE MONEY	11 7.2
DETERMINES/GENERATES (MORE) BUSINESS/SALES/WOULD WANT MORE SALES/DOWNLOADS	7 4.6
DETERMINES HOW FAST YOU MAKE MONEY	2 1.3
MY LIVELIHOOD DEPENDS ON IT/I NEED THE WORK/WANT TO CONTINUE WORKING	3 2.0

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 12

NET OF Q.2B/2C/3B/3C WHAT MAKES YOU SAY THAT (ANSWER FROM Q2A/3A) WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT/2ND MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
OTHER ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS MENTIONS	4 2.6
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	7 4.6
WOULD WANT/NEED A GROWING MARKET/CUSTOMER BASE	3 2.0
OTHER MARKET GROWTH MENTIONS	4 2.6
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	6 3.9
OTHER COMPANY RELATED MENTIONS	6 3.9
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
INDICATES/DETERMINES THE POPULARITY/SIZE OF USER BASE	4 2.6
WOULD WANT THE LARGEST AMOUNT OF USERS/TO REACH AS MANY PEOPLE AS POSSIBLE	34 22.4
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE MENTIONS	8 5.3
MISCELLANEOUS USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/POPULARITY/RETURN	
YOU WANT AN AUDIENCE/USER BASE/NO USE CREATING AN APPLICATION IF NO ONE WOULD USE IT/BUY IT	39 25.7
WE BUILD APPS FOR THE USERS/CUSTOMERS	5 3.3
NEED TO SUPPORT (ANY) PLATFORMS THAT CUSTOMERS USE	4 2.6

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 12

NET OF Q.2B/2C/3B/3C WHAT MAKES YOU SAY THAT (ANSWER FROM Q2A/3A) WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT/2ND MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS USER BASE/ MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/POPULARITY/ RETURN MENTIONS	8 5.3
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	66 43.4
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	32 21.1
TIME OF DEVELOPMENT (SUB-SUBNET)	16 10.5
DETERMINES THE TIME IT TAKES/ HOW FAST WE CAN WORK/DEVELOP THE APPLICATION	11 7.2
IT TAKES TIME TO DEVELOP/ CONCERNED ABOUT THE TIME I'M INVESTING	3 2.0
OTHER TIME OF DEVELOPMENT MENTIONS	2 1.3
MISCELLANEOUS TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT	
DETERMINES THE EFFORT INVOLVED/ WOULD WANT IT TO BE EASY TO USE/DEVELOP	10 6.6
PROGRAMMING/DEVELOPMENT IS IMPOSSIBLE/TOO DIFFICULT WITHOUT IT	2 1.3
EASIER IF THE PLATFORM/LANGUAGE IS SIMILAR TO WHAT WE ALREADY WORK WITH	2 1.3
SOME PLATFORMS/FRAMEWORKS ARE HORRIBLE TO USE/WRITE FOR	3 2.0
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT MENTIONS	5 3.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 12

NET OF Q.2B/2C/3B/3C WHAT MAKES YOU SAY THAT (ANSWER FROM Q2A/3A) WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT/2ND MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	20
	13.2
CONCERNED ABOUT THE COSTS/COST OF DEVELOPMENT RUNNING HIGH (UNSPEC)	10
	6.6
CONCERNED ABOUT THE BUDGET/NEED TO DEVELOP WITHIN BUDGET	4
	2.6
HAVE LIMITED RESOURCES (FOR DEVELOPMENT)	2
	1.3
OTHER DEVELOPMENT COSTS MENTIONS	6
	3.9
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	14
	9.2
IMPORTANT TO HAVE/NEED GOOD DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS	5
	3.3
NEED A GOOD/FRIENDLY INFRASTRUCTURE/SUPPORT ENVIRONMENT	3
	2.0
OTHER SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT MENTIONS	8
	5.3
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	16
	10.5
FAMILIARITY WITH THE PLATFORM/LANGUAGE/PREFER TO USE A LANGUAGE I ALREADY KNOW	5
	3.3
DETERMINES/NEED TO KNOW WHICH (NEW) LANGUAGES/PLATFORMS I HAVE TO LEARN/KEEP UP WITH	3
	2.0
WOULD WANT TO REUSE EXISTING CODE (RATHER THAN WRITING FROM SCRATCH)	3
	2.0
OTHER PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE MENTIONS	8
	5.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 12

NET OF Q.2B/2C/3B/3C WHAT MAKES YOU SAY THAT (ANSWER FROM Q2A/3A) WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT/2ND MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	
DETERMINES HOW MANY QUALIFIED DEVELOPERS ARE AVAILABLE/HOW EASY IT IS TO FIND THEM	2 1.3
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES MENTIONS	7 4.6
PLATFORM (NET)	23 15.1
I LIKE/AM SATISFIED WITH OTHER PLATFORM/OS/WHAT I USE NOW: ANDROID, APPLE/IOS	10 6.6
DON'T (USUALLY) DEVELOP FOR MICROSOFT/WINDOWS	3 2.0
DON'T (USUALLY) DEVELOP FOR BLACKBERRY	3 2.0
WANT/EXPECT GOOD PERFORMANCE FROM PLATFORM: SPEED, STABILITY, ETC.	4 2.6
OTHER PLATFORM MENTIONS	7 4.6
COMMITMENT TO PROJECT (NET)	4 2.6
DETERMINES INVESTMENT/FUNDING FOR THE PROJECT/WOULD NEED CLIENT/COMPANY INVESTMENT	3 2.0
OTHER COMMITMENT TO PROJECT MENTIONS	1 0.7
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	33 21.7
FUNCTIONALITY (SUBNET)	8 5.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 12

NET OF Q.2B/2C/3B/3C WHAT MAKES YOU SAY THAT (ANSWER FROM Q2A/3A) WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT/2ND MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
EFFECTS/DETERMINES THE FUNCTIONALITY OF THE APPLICATION	3 2.0
NEED/WANT TO IMPROVE/UPGRADE APPLICATIONS/ADD ADDITIONAL FEATURES/FUNCTIONALITY	3 2.0
MENTIONS OF SPECIFIC APPLICATIONS/FUNCTIONALITIES BEING DEVELOPED	1 0.7
OTHER FUNCTIONALITY MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION SPECIFIC	
APPLICATION NEEDS TO BE USABLE/ OTHERWISE PEOPLE COULDN'T USE THE APP	6 3.9
WOULD WANT APPLICATION TO SERVE A NEED/BE USEFUL/BENEFIT USERS	9 5.9
WOULD WANT APP TO BE EASY FOR CUSTOMERS TO USE/LEARN	5 3.3
(FOR THE) USER INTERFACE/ EXPERIENCE	3 2.0
OTHER APPLICATION SPECIFIC MENTIONS	8 5.3
COMPATIBILITY (NET)	15 9.9
WOULD WANT IT TO RUN ON MULTIPLE DEVICES/PLATFORMS	4 2.6
NEEDS TO BE MOBILE COMPATIBLE/RUN ON MOBILE DEVICES (AS WELL AS DESKTOP)	4 2.6
OTHER COMPATIBILITY MENTIONS	8 5.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 12

NET OF Q.2B/2C/3B/3C WHAT MAKES YOU SAY THAT (ANSWER FROM Q2A/3A) WILL BE THE MOST IMPORTANT/2ND MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION IN YOUR DECISION WHETHER TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MISCELLANEOUS	
IT'S IMPORTANT/NECESSARY (UNSPEC)	8 5.3
BASED ON MY EXPERIENCE	2 1.3
MAKES IT WORTHWHILE/OTHERWISE IT WOULD BE A WASTE OF TIME	22 14.5
DETERMINES IT'S SUCCESS/VIABILITY/ SUSTAINABILITY	9 5.9
PROBLEMS WITH HACKERS/IDENTITY THEFT/DATA BREACHES	2 1.3
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR/SELL TO CLIENTS/NEED TO SATISFY OUR CLIENTS	10 6.6
WOULD/MIGHT NEED TO SCALE UP/HIRE MORE PEOPLE/DEVELOPERS	6 3.9
CONCERNED WITH THE TECHNOLOGY BEING USED/IF IT'S NEW TECHNOLOGY	2 1.3
IT'S A COMPETITIVE MARKET/USERS HAVE MANY OPTIONS	3 2.0
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS MENTIONS	7 4.6
NON-RESPONSIVE ANSWER	1 0.7
DID NOT MENTION A FACTOR OR CONSIDERATION IN Q.1A/B	4 2.6

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 13

Q.4A SUPPOSE NOW YOU ARE APPROACHED BY A PROMOTER FOR A MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM THAT HAS BEEN AROUND FOR A FEW YEARS, BUT SO FAR YOU HAVE NOT DEVELOPED ANY APPLICATION FOR THAT PLATFORM. WHAT IS THE FIRST THING YOU WOULD WANT TO KNOW FROM THE PROMOTER ABOUT THAT PLATFORM BEFORE DECIDING IF YOU'LL DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT PLATFORM?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	54 35.5
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	54 35.5
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB- SUBNET)	5 3.3
THE REMUNERATION/WAS ABLE TO MAKE MONEY/GET PAID	2 1.3
PROFITABILITY/RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI)	3 2.0
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	13 8.6
ADOPTION RATE	1 0.7
PROJECTED MARKET SHARE/FUTURE OF PLATFORM	8 5.3
IS APP MARKETABLE/IS THERE A NEED/MARKET FOR IT/THE APP	1 0.7
WHERE DOES IT FIT IN THE CURRENT MARKET/TO SEE WHAT'S ALREADY IN THE MARKET/IS THIS A NEW APP/IDEA	3 2.0
THE MARKETPLACE/MARKET CONSIDERATIONS (UNSPEC)	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/(CURRENT) MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	33 21.7
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	2 1.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 13

Q.4A SUPPOSE NOW YOU ARE APPROACHED BY A PROMOTER FOR A MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM THAT HAS BEEN AROUND FOR A FEW YEARS, BUT SO FAR YOU HAVE NOT DEVELOPED ANY APPLICATION FOR THAT PLATFORM. WHAT IS THE FIRST THING YOU WOULD WANT TO KNOW FROM THE PROMOTER ABOUT THAT PLATFORM BEFORE DECIDING IF YOU'LL DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT PLATFORM?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE MENTIONS	3 2.0
MISCELLANEOUS USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/POPULARITY/RETURN	
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS USER BASE/ MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/POPULARITY/ RETURN MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE (NET)	4 2.6
TARGET MARKET/DEMOGRAPHIC/WHO IS THE AUDIENCE/CUSTOMER	4 2.6
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	41 27.0
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	9 5.9
EASE OF USE/EASE/DIFFICULTY OF DEVELOPMENT	6 3.9
EASE OF LEARNING LANGUAGE/HOW FAST CAN I LEARN THE SYSTEM/ LANGUAGE	1 0.7
INTEGRATION/EASE/ABILITY OF ADAPTING CURRENT CODE TO DIFFERENT PLATFORMS	2 1.3
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	3 2.0
COST TO DEVELOP	3 2.0
OTHER DEVELOPMENT COSTS MENTIONS	1 0.7
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	18 11.8

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 13

Q.4A SUPPOSE NOW YOU ARE APPROACHED BY A PROMOTER FOR A MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM THAT HAS BEEN AROUND FOR A FEW YEARS, BUT SO FAR YOU HAVE NOT DEVELOPED ANY APPLICATION FOR THAT PLATFORM. WHAT IS THE FIRST THING YOU WOULD WANT TO KNOW FROM THE PROMOTER ABOUT THAT PLATFORM BEFORE DECIDING IF YOU'LL DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT PLATFORM?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
SUPPORT/RESOURCES AVAILABLE	4 2.6
DOCUMENTATION/AVAILABILITY/ QUALITY OF DOCUMENTATION	3 2.0
DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS AVAILABLE/WHAT IS THE SDK/API ACCESS	6 3.9
FRAMEWORK/IS THERE A FRAMEWORK AVAILABLE TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS	4 2.6
EXAMPLES/TEST ENVIRONMENTS/OTHER APPLICATIONS I COULD LOOK AT/ LEARN FROM	1 0.7
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	17 11.2
MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (OF PLATFORM)/LIKE THE PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	16 10.5
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES MENTIONS	1 0.7
PLATFORM (NET)	14 9.2
THE PLATFORM/WHAT PLATFORM IT'S BUILT ON	3 2.0
OPERATING SYSTEM OF PLATFORM	2 1.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 13

Q.4A SUPPOSE NOW YOU ARE APPROACHED BY A PROMOTER FOR A MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM THAT HAS BEEN AROUND FOR A FEW YEARS, BUT SO FAR YOU HAVE NOT DEVELOPED ANY APPLICATION FOR THAT PLATFORM. WHAT IS THE FIRST THING YOU WOULD WANT TO KNOW FROM THE PROMOTER ABOUT THAT PLATFORM BEFORE DECIDING IF YOU'LL DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT PLATFORM?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
(IS) PLATFORM OPEN/IS IT OPEN-SOURCE	1 0.7
WHY THEY CHOSE THE PLATFORM/WHAT MAKES PLATFORM NEW/DIFFERENT	3 2.0
CAPABILITIES OF PLATFORM	1 0.7
SECURITY/SECURE PLATFORM	4 2.6
OTHER PLATFORM MENTIONS	2 1.3
DEVICE RELATED (NET)	7 4.6
WHAT DEVICES THE PLATFORM WAS ON	3 2.0
FEATURES OF DEVICE: RESOLUTION, SPEAKERS, ETC.	2 1.3
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	2 1.3
COMMITMENT TO PROJECT (NET)	6 3.9
MARKETING PLANS/HOW WILL IT BE MARKETING	4 2.6
(WHETHER) COMPANY IS/WAS BEHIND PROJECT/PRODUCT	1 0.7
OTHER COMMITMENT TO PROJECT MENTIONS	1 0.7
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	12 7.9
(UNDERSTANDING) THE APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS	2 1.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 13

Q.4A SUPPOSE NOW YOU ARE APPROACHED BY A PROMOTER FOR A MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM THAT HAS BEEN AROUND FOR A FEW YEARS, BUT SO FAR YOU HAVE NOT DEVELOPED ANY APPLICATION FOR THAT PLATFORM. WHAT IS THE FIRST THING YOU WOULD WANT TO KNOW FROM THE PROMOTER ABOUT THAT PLATFORM BEFORE DECIDING IF YOU'LL DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT PLATFORM?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
FUNCTIONALITY/PURPOSE OF APPLICATION/WHAT THEY WANT IT TO DO	8 5.3
WHETHER I LIKE IT/IF IT IS AN APP THAT INTERESTS ME	1 0.7
OTHER APPLICATION SPECIFIC MENTIONS	1 0.7
COMPATIBILITY (NET)	5 3.3
COMPATIBILITY WITH OTHER DEVICES/ OPERATING SYSTEMS/PLATFORMS	4 2.6
OTHER COMPATIBILITY MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS	
THE NEEDS OF THE CLIENT/IT WAS MY JOB/CLIENT/COMPANY REQUESTED	3 2.0
NUMBER OF OTHER PEOPLE DEVELOPING FOR THAT PROGRAM	1 0.7
THE TECHNOLOGY/TECHNOLOGICAL POTENTIAL	2 1.3
THE ANALYTICS	1 0.7
SCALABILITY	1 0.7
WHY I WOULD BE DOING IT/WHAT IS THE POINT?/IS IT WORTHWHILE	4 2.6
IS IT LEGAL/ARE THEIR COPYRIGHT ISSUES	1 0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS MENTIONS	6 3.9

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 13

Q.4A SUPPOSE NOW YOU ARE APPROACHED BY A PROMOTER FOR A MOBILE DEVICE PLATFORM THAT HAS BEEN AROUND FOR A FEW YEARS,
BUT SO FAR YOU HAVE NOT DEVELOPED ANY APPLICATION FOR THAT PLATFORM. WHAT IS THE FIRST THING YOU WOULD WANT TO KNOW FROM
THE PROMOTER ABOUT THAT PLATFORM BEFORE DECIDING IF YOU'LL DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT PLATFORM?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
NONE/DON'T KNOW/NO OTHERS	7
	4.6

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 14

NET OF Q.4A/4B FIRST/SECOND THING YOU WOULD WANT TO KNOW FROM THE PROMOTER ABOUT THAT PLATFORM
BEFORE DECIDING IF YOU'LL DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT PLATFORM.

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	74 48.7
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	74 48.7
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB- SUBNET)	9 5.9
THE REMUNERATION/WAS ABLE TO MAKE MONEY/GET PAID	4 2.6
PROFITABILITY/RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI)	5 3.3
OTHER ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS MENTIONS	1 0.7
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	25 16.4
ADOPTION RATE	1 0.7
PROJECTED MARKET SHARE/FUTURE OF PLATFORM	16 10.5
IS APP MARKETABLE/IS THERE A NEED/MARKET FOR IT/THE APP	5 3.3
WHERE DOES IT FIT IN THE CURRENT MARKET/TO SEE WHAT'S ALREADY IN THE MARKET/IS THIS A NEW APP/IDEA	4 2.6
THE MARKETPLACE/MARKET CONSIDERATIONS (UNSPEC)	1 0.7
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	5 3.3
WHAT COMPANY IS BEHIND THE PLATFORM	4 2.6

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 14

NET OF Q.4A/4B FIRST/SECOND THING YOU WOULD WANT TO KNOW FROM THE PROMOTER ABOUT THAT PLATFORM
BEFORE DECIDING IF YOU'LL DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT PLATFORM.

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
OTHER COMPANY RELATED MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/ (CURRENT)	42
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	27.6
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	4 2.6
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE MENTIONS	3 2.0
MISCELLANEOUS USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/POPULARITY/RETURN	
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS USER BASE/ MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/POPULARITY/ RETURN MENTIONS	2 1.3
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE (NET)	12 7.9
TARGET MARKET/DEMOGRAPHIC/WHO IS THE AUDIENCE/CUSTOMER	9 5.9
HAS A FOCUS ON BUSINESS/BUSINESS USERS	2 1.3
OTHER DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE MENTIONS	2 1.3
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	73 48.0
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	19 12.5
EASE OF USE/EASE/DIFFICULTY OF DEVELOPMENT	13 8.6
EASE OF LEARNING LANGUAGE/HOW FAST CAN I LEARN THE SYSTEM/ LANGUAGE	3 2.0

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 14

NET OF Q.4A/4B FIRST/SECOND THING YOU WOULD WANT TO KNOW FROM THE PROMOTER ABOUT THAT PLATFORM
BEFORE DECIDING IF YOU'LL DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT PLATFORM.

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
TIME REQUIRED/TIME TO MARKET	2 1.3
INTEGRATION/EASE/ABILITY OF ADAPTING CURRENT CODE TO DIFFERENT PLATFORMS	2 1.3
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	7 4.6
COST TO DEVELOP	5 3.3
COST OF DEVELOPMENT TOOLS/FEES REQUIRED TO DEVELOP FOR THAT PROGRAM	1 0.7
(IS IT) FREE/NO COST FOR TOOL/ LICENSE	1 0.7
(IF I) ALREADY HAD THE COMPUTER/ DIDN'T NOT NEED TO GET ANOTHER COMPUTER	1 0.7
OTHER DEVELOPMENT COSTS MENTIONS	1 0.7
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	40 26.3
SUPPORT/RESOURCES AVAILABLE	11 7.2
DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT/IS IT ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY	1 0.7
DOCUMENTATION/AVAILABILITY/ QUALITY OF DOCUMENTATION	5 3.3
DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS AVAILABLE/WHAT IS THE SDK/API ACCESS	17 11.2
FRAMEWORK/IS THERE A FRAMEWORK AVAILABLE TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS	5 3.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 14

NET OF Q.4A/4B FIRST/SECOND THING YOU WOULD WANT TO KNOW FROM THE PROMOTER ABOUT THAT PLATFORM
BEFORE DECIDING IF YOU'LL DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT PLATFORM.

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
EXAMPLES/TEST ENVIRONMENTS/OTHER	4
APPLICATIONS I COULD LOOK AT/ LEARN FROM	2.6
OTHER SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT MENTIONS	4 2.6
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	22 14.5
FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/ LANGUAGE (SUB-SUBNET)	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/LANGUAGE	
HAD EXPOSURE TO IT ALREADY/ ALREADY KNEW THE LANGUAGE/ BUILT ON A LANGUAGE I ALREADY KNEW	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (OF PLATFORM) /LIKE THE PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	20 13.2
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE MENTIONS	2 1.3
MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES MENTIONS	3 2.0
PLATFORM (NET)	26 17.1
THE PLATFORM/WHAT PLATFORM IT'S BUILT ON	6 3.9
OPERATING SYSTEM OF PLATFORM	2 1.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 14

NET OF Q.4A/4B FIRST/SECOND THING YOU WOULD WANT TO KNOW FROM THE PROMOTER ABOUT THAT PLATFORM
BEFORE DECIDING IF YOU'LL DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT PLATFORM.

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
(IS) PLATFORM OPEN/IS IT OPEN-SOURCE	3 2.0
IT WAS NEW/A NEW PLATFORM/WAS CURIOUS ABOUT PLATFORM	1 0.7
WHY THEY CHOSE THE PLATFORM/WHAT MAKES PLATFORM NEW/DIFFERENT	6 3.9
CAPABILITIES OF PLATFORM	5 3.3
SECURITY/SECURE PLATFORM	4 2.6
OTHER PLATFORM MENTIONS	5 3.3
DEVICE RELATED (NET)	12 7.9
WHAT DEVICES THE PLATFORM WAS ON	6 3.9
FEATURES OF DEVICE: RESOLUTION, SPEAKERS, ETC.	2 1.3
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	4 2.6
COMMITMENT TO PROJECT (NET)	12 7.9
MARKETING PLANS/HOW WILL IT BE MARKETING	7 4.6
(WHETHER) COMPANY IS/WAS BEHIND PROJECT/PRODUCT	3 2.0
APP STORE/INTERFACE FOR SELLING APP	2 1.3
OTHER COMMITMENT TO PROJECT MENTIONS	2 1.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 14

NET OF Q.4A/4B FIRST/SECOND THING YOU WOULD WANT TO KNOW FROM THE PROMOTER ABOUT THAT PLATFORM
BEFORE DECIDING IF YOU'LL DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT PLATFORM.

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	19
	12.5
(UNDERSTANDING) THE APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS	3
	2.0
FUNCTIONALITY/PURPOSE OF APPLICATION/WHAT THEY WANT IT TO DO	12
	7.9
WHETHER I LIKE IT/IF IT IS AN APP THAT INTERESTS ME	1
	0.7
USER INTERFACE (UI)/EXPERIENCE	1
	0.7
OTHER APPLICATION SPECIFIC MENTIONS	2
	1.3
COMPATIBILITY (NET)	11
	7.2
COMPATIBILITY WITH OTHER DEVICES/OPERATING SYSTEMS/PLATFORMS	8
	5.3
OTHER COMPATIBILITY MENTIONS	3
	2.0
MISCELLANEOUS	
THE NEEDS OF THE CLIENT/IT WAS MY JOB/CLIENT/COMPANY REQUESTED	4
	2.6
NUMBER OF JOBS AVAILABLE DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS ON THAT PLATFORM	1
	0.7
NUMBER OF OTHER PEOPLE DEVELOPING FOR THAT PROGRAM	3
	2.0
THE TECHNOLOGY/TECHNOLOGICAL POTENTIAL	5
	3.3
THE ANALYTICS	1
	0.7
SCALABILITY	2
	1.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 14

NET OF Q.4A/4B FIRST/SECOND THING YOU WOULD WANT TO KNOW FROM THE PROMOTER ABOUT THAT PLATFORM
BEFORE DECIDING IF YOU'LL DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT PLATFORM.

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
WHY I WOULD BE DOING IT/WHAT IS THE POINT?/IS IT WORTHWHILE	5 3.3
IS IT LEGAL/ARE THEIR COPYRIGHT ISSUES	2 1.3
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS MENTIONS	8 5.3
DON'T KNOW/NO ANSWER	7 4.6

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 15

Q.5A YOU MENTIONED EARLIER THAT YOU HAVE DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM.
AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT YEAR DID YOU START OFFERING APPLICATIONS FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET	116 76.3
2007	5 3.3
2008	4 2.6
2009	9 5.9
2010	20 13.2
2011	16 10.5
2012	21 13.8
2013	17 11.2
2014	12 7.9
2015	12 7.9
HAVE NOT DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET	36 23.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 16

Q.5B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET	116 76.3
FIRST FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	114 75.0
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	66 43.4
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	66 43.4
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	25 16.4
ADOPTION RATE	1 0.7
MARKET SHARE WAS GROWING/ BECOMING MORE POPULAR/THEY WERE CAPTURING THE MARKET	13 8.6
IS APP MARKETABLE/IS THERE A NEED/MARKET FOR IT/THE APP	2 1.3
WHERE DOES IT FIT IN THE CURRENT MARKET/TO SEE WHAT'S ALREADY IN THE MARKET/IS THIS A NEW APP/IDEA	2 1.3
THE GROWTH OF MOBILE APPLICATIONS/WANTED TO GET INTO THE GROWING MOBILE MARKET	7 4.6
THE MARKETPLACE/MARKET CONSIDERATIONS (UNSPEC)	2 1.3
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	4 2.6
(LIKE) THE COMPANY/BRAND (APPLE, GOOGLE, ETC)	1 0.7
THEY ARE MARKET LEADERS/MAJOR COMPETITORS	2 1.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 16

Q.5B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
OTHER COMPANY RELATED MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/ (CURRENT)	32
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	21.1
HAD THE MOST USERS/BIGGEST MARKET SHARE (AT THE TIME)	2 1.3
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	4 2.6
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE (NET)	1 0.7
OTHER DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	23 15.1
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	4 2.6
EASE OF USE/EASE/DIFFICULTY OF DEVELOPMENT	2 1.3
EASE OF LEARNING LANGUAGE/HOW FAST CAN I LEARN THE SYSTEM/ LANGUAGE	1 0.7
TIME REQUIRED/TIME TO MARKET	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	4 2.6
COST TO DEVELOP	1 0.7
COSTS LESS TO DEVELOP FOR THAT PLATFORM/OPERATING SYSTEM	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 16

Q.5B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
(IS IT) FREE/NO COST FOR TOOL/ LICENSE	1 0.7
OTHER DEVELOPMENT COSTS MENTIONS	1 0.7
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS AVAILABLE/WHAT IS THE SDK/API ACCESS	1 0.7
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	15 9.9
FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/ LANGUAGE (SUB-SUBNET)	14 9.2
JAVA (SUB-SUB-SUBNET)	7 4.6
IT'S JAVA/(ANDROID IS) BUILT ON JAVA	2 1.3
HAVE EXPERIENCE WITH JAVA/ USED JAVA BEFORE	2 1.3
EASY TO TRANSITION TO BECAUSE IT'S JAVA-BASED	2 1.3
WAS LEARNING THE LANGUAGE FOR ANDROID WHICH WAS JAVA SO IT WAS EASY	1 0.7
LEARNED JAVA IN SCHOOL	2 1.3
EASY TO DEVELOP WITH JAVA ON ANDROID	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 16

Q.5B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MISCELLANEOUS FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/LANGUAGE	
HAD EXPOSURE TO IT ALREADY/	5
ALREADY KNEW THE LANGUAGE/	3.3
BUILT ON A LANGUAGE I ALREADY	
KNEW	
WORKED (EXCLUSIVELY) ON THAT	2
PLATFORM SINCE SCHOOL/	1.3
THROUGHOUT MY CAREER	
MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING	1
LANGUAGE MENTIONS	0.7
PLATFORM (NET)	9
	5.9
THE PLATFORM/WHAT PLATFORM IT'S	3
BUILT ON	2.0
OPERATING SYSTEM OF PLATFORM	1
	0.7
(IS) PLATFORM OPEN/IS IT OPEN-	5
SOURCE	3.3
SECURITY/SECURE PLATFORM	1
	0.7
DEVICE RELATED (NET)	6
	3.9
HAVE/LIKE THE DEVICE (I HAVE AN	1
IPHONE, FAN OF ANDROID PHONES)	0.7
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES	4
USE THAT PLATFORM	2.6
OTHER DEVICE RELATED MENTIONS	1
	0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 16

Q.5B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
COMMITMENT TO PROJECT (NET)	2 1.3
MARKETING PLANS/HOW WILL IT BE MARKETED	1 0.7
APP STORE/INTERFACE FOR SELLING APP	1 0.7
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	6 3.9
FUNCTIONALITY/PURPOSE OF APPLICATION/WHAT THEY WANT IT TO DO	4 2.6
USER INTERFACE (UI)/EXPERIENCE	1 0.7
OTHER APPLICATION SPECIFIC MENTIONS	1 0.7
COMPATIBILITY (NET)	3 2.0
COMPATIBILITY WITH OTHER DEVICES/ OPERATING SYSTEMS/PLATFORMS	3 2.0
FIT MY INTERESTS/LIFESTYLE (NET)	3 2.0
WANTED TO LEARN/STAY FRESH/CURRENT/ KEEP UP WITH TECHNOLOGY/STAY RELEVANT	1 0.7
SOMETHING THAT I FOUND INTERESTING/ SOMETHING I WANTED TO GET INTO	2 1.3
MISCELLANEOUS	
THE NEEDS OF THE CLIENT/IT WAS MY JOB/CLIENT/COMPANY REQUESTED	10 6.6
NUMBER OF JOBS AVAILABLE DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS ON THAT PLATFORM	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 16

Q.5B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
THE TECHNOLOGY/TECHNOLOGICAL POTENTIAL	1 0.7
SCALABILITY	1 0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS MENTIONS	2 1.3
SECOND FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	60 39.5
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	16 10.5
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	16 10.5
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB- SUBNET)	3 2.0
THE REMUNERATION/WAS ABLE TO MAKE MONEY/GET PAID	1 0.7
PROFITABILITY/RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI)	2 1.3
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	5 3.3
ADOPTION RATE	1 0.7
MARKET SHARE WAS GROWING/ BECOMING MORE POPULAR/THEY WERE CAPTURING THE MARKET	1 0.7
IS APP MARKETABLE/IS THERE A NEED/MARKET FOR IT/THE APP	2 1.3
JAVA IS THE FASTEST GROWING LANGUAGE IN THE WORLD	1 0.7
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 16

Q.5B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
(LIKE) THE COMPANY/BRAND (APPLE, GOOGLE, ETC)	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/ (CURRENT)	6
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	3.9
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	21 13.8
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	5 3.3
EASE OF USE/EASE/DIFFICULTY OF DEVELOPMENT	3 2.0
EASE OF LEARNING LANGUAGE/HOW FAST CAN I LEARN THE SYSTEM/ LANGUAGE	1 0.7
INTEGRATION/EASE/ABILITY OF ADAPTING CURRENT CODE TO DIFFERENT PLATFORMS	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	6 3.9
COSTS LESS TO DEVELOP FOR THAT PLATFORM/OPERATING SYSTEM	3 2.0
(IS IT) FREE/NO COST FOR TOOL/ LICENSE	4 2.6
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	3 2.0
DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS AVAILABLE/WHAT IS THE SDK/API ACCESS	2 1.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 16

Q.5B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
OTHER SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT MENTIONS	1 0.7
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	6 3.9
FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/ LANGUAGE (SUB-SUBNET)	6 3.9
JAVA (SUB-SUB-SUBNET)	3 2.0
EASY TO PROGRAM FOR BECAUSE IT'S JAVA/JAVA-BASED	1 0.7
STANDARD JAVA-BASED LANGUAGE	1 0.7
JAVA IS THE FASTEST GROWING LANGUAGE IN THE WORLD	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/LANGUAGE	
HAD EXPOSURE TO IT ALREADY/ ALREADY KNEW THE LANGUAGE/ BUILT ON A LANGUAGE I ALREADY KNEW	3 2.0
MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	
AVAILABILITY OF DEVELOPERS TO WORK ON PLATFORM/PROJECT	1 0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES MENTIONS	1 0.7
PLATFORM (NET)	6 3.9
THE PLATFORM/WHAT PLATFORM IT'S BUILT ON	1 0.7
(IS) PLATFORM OPEN/IS IT OPEN- SOURCE	3 2.0

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 16

Q.5B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
OTHER PLATFORM MENTIONS	2 1.3
DEVICE RELATED (NET)	1 0.7
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	1 0.7
COMMITMENT TO PROJECT (NET)	2 1.3
(WHETHER) COMPANY IS/WAS BEHIND PROJECT/PRODUCT	1 0.7
APP STORE/INTERFACE FOR SELLING APP	1 0.7
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	3 2.0
(UNDERSTANDING) THE APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS	1 0.7
USER INTERFACE (UI)/EXPERIENCE	1 0.7
OTHER APPLICATION SPECIFIC MENTIONS	1 0.7
FIT MY INTERESTS/LIFESTYLE (NET)	4 2.6
SOMETHING THAT I FOUND INTERESTING/ SOMETHING I WANTED TO GET INTO	4 2.6
MISCELLANEOUS	
THE NEEDS OF THE CLIENT/IT WAS MY JOB/CLIENT/COMPANY REQUESTED	5 3.3
NUMBER OF JOBS AVAILABLE DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS ON THAT PLATFORM	4 2.6
THE TECHNOLOGY/TECHNOLOGICAL POTENTIAL	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 16

Q.5B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS MENTIONS	1 0.7
THIRD FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	18 11.8
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	5 3.3
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	5 3.3
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	3 2.0
(LIKE) THE COMPANY/BRAND (APPLE, GOOGLE, ETC)	3 2.0
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/ (CURRENT)	2
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	1.3
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	6 3.9
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	1 0.7
EASE OF USE/EASE/DIFFICULTY OF DEVELOPMENT	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	1 0.7
(IF I) ALREADY HAD THE COMPUTER/ DIDN'T NOT NEED TO GET ANOTHER COMPUTER	1 0.7
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	2 1.3
SUPPORT/RESOURCES AVAILABLE	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 16

Q.5B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS AVAILABLE/WHAT IS THE SDK/API ACCESS	1 0.7
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	3 2.0
FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/ LANGUAGE (SUB-SUBNET)	3 2.0
JAVA (SUB-SUB-SUBNET)	3 2.0
IT'S JAVA/(ANDROID IS) BUILT ON JAVA	1 0.7
HAVE EXPERIENCE WITH JAVA/ USED JAVA BEFORE	1 0.7
SAMSUNG SUPPORTS JAVA LANGUAGE	1 0.7
PLATFORM (NET)	1 0.7
OPERATING SYSTEM OF PLATFORM	1 0.7
DEVICE RELATED (NET)	1 0.7
HAVE/LIKE THE DEVICE (I HAVE AN IPHONE, FAN OF ANDROID PHONES)	1 0.7
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	4 2.6
(UNDERSTANDING) THE APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS	1 0.7
USER INTERFACE (UI)/EXPERIENCE	2 1.3
OTHER APPLICATION SPECIFIC MENTIONS	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 16

Q.5B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
FIT MY INTERESTS/LIFESTYLE (NET)	1 0.7
LOVE/ENJOY PROGRAMMING	1 0.7
FOURTH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	5 3.3
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	4 2.6
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	4 2.6
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	2 1.3
MARKET SHARE WAS GROWING/ BECOMING MORE POPULAR/THEY WERE CAPTURING THE MARKET	1 0.7
THE MARKETPLACE/MARKET CONSIDERATIONS (UNSPEC)	1 0.7
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	2 1.3
(LIKE) THE COMPANY/BRAND (APPLE, GOOGLE, ETC)	1 0.7
OTHER COMPANY RELATED MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/ (CURRENT)	1
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	0.7
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	1 0.7
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 16

Q.5B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
TIME REQUIRED/TIME TO MARKET	1 0.7
DEVICE RELATED (NET)	1 0.7
FEATURES OF DEVICE: RESOLUTION, SPEAKERS, ETC.	1 0.7
NONE	2 1.3
HAVE NOT DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET	36 23.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 17

Q.5C ANY OTHER FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LED TO YOUR DECISION TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM? (FIFTH-SEVENTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET	116 76.3
FIFTH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	29 19.1
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	12 7.9
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	12 7.9
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB- SUBNET)	2 1.3
THE REMUNERATION/WAS ABLE TO MAKE MONEY/GET PAID	2 1.3
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	5 3.3
ADOPTION RATE	1 0.7
PROJECTED MARKET SHARE/FUTURE OF PLATFORM	1 0.7
MARKET SHARE WAS GROWING/ BECOMING MORE POPULAR/THEY WERE CAPTURING THE MARKET	1 0.7
THE GROWTH OF MOBILE APPLICATIONS/WANTED TO GET INTO THE GROWING MOBILE MARKET	2 1.3
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	1 0.7
(LIKE) THE COMPANY/BRAND (APPLE, GOOGLE, ETC)	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/ (CURRENT)	4
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	2.6

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 17

Q.5C ANY OTHER FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LED TO YOUR DECISION TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM? (FIFTH-SEVENTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	2 1.3
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE (NET)	1 0.7
OTHER DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	9 5.9
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	1 0.7
TIME REQUIRED/TIME TO MARKET	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	3 2.0
COST TO DEVELOP	1 0.7
COSTS LESS TO DEVELOP FOR THAT PLATFORM/OPERATING SYSTEM	2 1.3
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	1 0.7
OTHER SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT MENTIONS	1 0.7
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	4 2.6
FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/ LANGUAGE (SUB-SUBNET)	4 2.6
JAVA (SUB-SUB-SUBNET)	1 0.7
HAVE EXPERIENCE WITH JAVA/ USED JAVA BEFORE	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 17

Q.5C ANY OTHER FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LED TO YOUR DECISION TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM? (FIFTH-SEVENTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MISCELLANEOUS FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/LANGUAGE	
HAD EXPOSURE TO IT ALREADY/	2
ALREADY KNEW THE LANGUAGE/	1.3
BUILT ON A LANGUAGE I ALREADY	
KNEW	
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS	1
FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/	0.7
LANGUAGE MENTIONS	
PLATFORM (NET)	6
	3.9
THE PLATFORM/WHAT PLATFORM IT'S	1
BUILT ON	0.7
(IS) PLATFORM OPEN/IS IT OPEN-	4
SOURCE	2.6
IT WAS NEW/A NEW PLATFORM/WAS	1
CURIOUS ABOUT PLATFORM	0.7
OTHER PLATFORM MENTIONS	1
	0.7
DEVICE RELATED (NET)	4
	2.6
HAVE/LIKE THE DEVICE (I HAVE AN	1
IPHONE, FAN OF ANDROID PHONES)	0.7
FEATURES OF DEVICE: RESOLUTION,	1
SPEAKERS, ETC.	0.7
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES	2
USE THAT PLATFORM	1.3
MISCELLANEOUS	
THE ANALYTICS	1
	0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 17

Q.5C ANY OTHER FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LED TO YOUR DECISION TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM? (FIFTH-SEVENTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
SIXTH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	3 2.0
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	2 1.3
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	2 1.3
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	1 0.7
THE GROWTH OF MOBILE APPLICATIONS/WANTED TO GET INTO THE GROWING MOBILE MARKET	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	1 0.7
DEVICE RELATED (NET)	1 0.7
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS	
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS MENTIONS	1 0.7
SEVENTH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	1 0.7
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	1 0.7
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	1 0.7
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB- SUBNET)	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 17

Q.5C ANY OTHER FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LED TO YOUR DECISION TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM? (FIFTH-SEVENTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
THE REMUNERATION/WAS ABLE TO MAKE MONEY/GET PAID	1 0.7
NONE	87 57.2
HAVE NOT DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET	36 23.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 18

Q.5B/5C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET	116 76.3
MENTIONED A FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	114 75.0
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	80 52.6
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	80 52.6
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB- SUBNET)	6 3.9
THE REMUNERATION/WAS ABLE TO MAKE MONEY/GET PAID	4 2.6
PROFITABILITY/RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI)	2 1.3
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	35 23.0
ADOPTION RATE	3 2.0
PROJECTED MARKET SHARE/FUTURE OF PLATFORM	1 0.7
MARKET SHARE WAS GROWING/ BECOMING MORE POPULAR/THEY WERE CAPTURING THE MARKET	16 10.5
IS APP MARKETABLE/IS THERE A NEED/MARKET FOR IT/THE APP	4 2.6
WHERE DOES IT FIT IN THE CURRENT MARKET/TO SEE WHAT'S ALREADY IN THE MARKET/IS THIS A NEW APP/IDEA	2 1.3
THE GROWTH OF MOBILE APPLICATIONS/WANTED TO GET INTO THE GROWING MOBILE MARKET	9 5.9

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 18

Q.5B/5C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
THE MARKETPLACE/MARKET CONSIDERATIONS (UNSPEC)	3 2.0
JAVA IS THE FASTEST GROWING LANGUAGE IN THE WORLD	1 0.7
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	10 6.6
(LIKE) THE COMPANY/BRAND (APPLE, GOOGLE, ETC)	7 4.6
THEY ARE MARKET LEADERS/MAJOR COMPETITORS	2 1.3
OTHER COMPANY RELATED MENTIONS	2 1.3
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/(CURRENT)	41
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	27.0
HAD THE MOST USERS/BIGGEST MARKET SHARE (AT THE TIME)	2 1.3
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	8 5.3
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE (NET)	2 1.3
OTHER DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE MENTIONS	2 1.3
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	48 31.6
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	12 7.9
EASE OF USE/EASE/DIFFICULTY OF DEVELOPMENT	6 3.9

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 18

Q.5B/5C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
EASE OF LEARNING LANGUAGE/HOW FAST CAN I LEARN THE SYSTEM/ LANGUAGE	2 1.3
TIME REQUIRED/TIME TO MARKET	3 2.0
INTEGRATION/EASE/ABILITY OF ADAPTING CURRENT CODE TO DIFFERENT PLATFORMS	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	12 7.9
COST TO DEVELOP	2 1.3
COSTS LESS TO DEVELOP FOR THAT PLATFORM/OPERATING SYSTEM	6 3.9
(IS IT) FREE/NO COST FOR TOOL/ LICENSE	5 3.3
(IF I) ALREADY HAD THE COMPUTER/ DIDN'T NOT NEED TO GET ANOTHER COMPUTER	1 0.7
OTHER DEVELOPMENT COSTS MENTIONS	1 0.7
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	6 3.9
SUPPORT/RESOURCES AVAILABLE	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS AVAILABLE/WHAT IS THE SDK/API ACCESS	3 2.0
OTHER SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT MENTIONS	2 1.3
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	27 17.8

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 18

Q.5B/5C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/ LANGUAGE (SUB-SUBNET)	26 17.1
JAVA (SUB-SUB-SUBNET)	14 9.2
IT'S JAVA/ (ANDROID IS) BUILT ON JAVA	3 2.0
HAVE EXPERIENCE WITH JAVA/ USED JAVA BEFORE	4 2.6
EASY TO TRANSITION TO BECAUSE IT'S JAVA-BASED	2 1.3
EASY TO PROGRAM FOR BECAUSE IT'S JAVA/JAVA-BASED	1 0.7
SAMSUNG SUPPORTS JAVA LANGUAGE	1 0.7
WAS LEARNING THE LANGUAGE FOR ANDROID WHICH WAS JAVA SO IT WAS EASY	1 0.7
LEARNED JAVA IN SCHOOL	2 1.3
EASY TO DEVELOP WITH JAVA ON ANDROID	1 0.7
STANDARD JAVA-BASED LANGUAGE	1 0.7
JAVA IS THE FASTEST GROWING LANGUAGE IN THE WORLD	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/LANGUAGE	
HAD EXPOSURE TO IT ALREADY/ ALREADY KNEW THE LANGUAGE/ BUILT ON A LANGUAGE I ALREADY KNEW	10 6.6

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 18

Q.5B/5C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
WORKED (EXCLUSIVELY) ON THAT PLATFORM SINCE SCHOOL/ THROUGHOUT MY CAREER	2 1.3
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/ LANGUAGE MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	
AVAILABILITY OF DEVELOPERS TO WORK ON PLATFORM/PROJECT	1 0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES MENTIONS	1 0.7
PLATFORM (NET)	22 14.5
THE PLATFORM/WHAT PLATFORM IT'S BUILT ON	5 3.3
OPERATING SYSTEM OF PLATFORM	2 1.3
(IS) PLATFORM OPEN/IS IT OPEN- SOURCE	12 7.9
IT WAS NEW/A NEW PLATFORM/WAS CURIOUS ABOUT PLATFORM	1 0.7
SECURITY/SECURE PLATFORM	1 0.7
OTHER PLATFORM MENTIONS	3 2.0

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 18

Q.5B/5C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVICE RELATED (NET)	13 8.6
HAVE/LIKE THE DEVICE (I HAVE AN IPHONE, FAN OF ANDROID PHONES)	3 2.0
FEATURES OF DEVICE: RESOLUTION, SPEAKERS, ETC.	2 1.3
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	8 5.3
OTHER DEVICE RELATED MENTIONS	1 0.7
COMMITMENT TO PROJECT (NET)	4 2.6
MARKETING PLANS/HOW WILL IT BE MARKETED	1 0.7
(WHETHER) COMPANY IS/WAS BEHIND PROJECT/PRODUCT	1 0.7
APP STORE/INTERFACE FOR SELLING APP	2 1.3
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	10 6.6
(UNDERSTANDING) THE APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS	2 1.3
FUNCTIONALITY/PURPOSE OF APPLICATION/WHAT THEY WANT IT TO DO	4 2.6
USER INTERFACE (UI)/EXPERIENCE	3 2.0
OTHER APPLICATION SPECIFIC MENTIONS	3 2.0
COMPATIBILITY (NET)	3 2.0

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 18

Q.5B/5C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
COMPATIBILITY WITH OTHER DEVICES/ OPERATING SYSTEMS/PLATFORMS	3 2.0
FIT MY INTERESTS/LIFESTYLE (NET)	7 4.6
LOVE/ENJOY PROGRAMMING	1 0.7
WANTED TO LEARN/STAY FRESH/CURRENT/ KEEP UP WITH TECHNOLOGY/STAY RELEVANT	1 0.7
SOMETHING THAT I FOUND INTERESTING/ SOMETHING I WANTED TO GET INTO	6 3.9
MISCELLANEOUS	
THE NEEDS OF THE CLIENT/IT WAS MY JOB/CLIENT/COMPANY REQUESTED	14 9.2
NUMBER OF JOBS AVAILABLE DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS ON THAT PLATFORM	5 3.3
THE TECHNOLOGY/TECHNOLOGICAL POTENTIAL	2 1.3
THE ANALYTICS	1 0.7
SCALABILITY	1 0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS MENTIONS	4 2.6
NONE	2 1.3
HAVE NOT DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR ANDROID PHONE OR TABLET	36 23.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 19

Q.6A YOU MENTIONED EARLIER THAT YOU HAVE DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM.
AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT YEAR DID YOU START OFFERING APPLICATIONS FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS	132 86.8
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS AND ANSWERED QUESTION	117 77.0
2007	5 3.3
2008	9 5.9
2009	15 9.9
2010	14 9.2
2011	16 10.5
2012	22 14.5
2013	15 9.9
2014	9 5.9
2015	12 7.9
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS AND DID NOT ANSWER QUESTION	15 9.9
HAVE NOT DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS	20 13.2

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 20

Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS	132 86.8
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS AND ANSWERED QUESTION	117 77.0
FIRST FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	116 76.3
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	61 40.1
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	61 40.1
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB- SUBNET)	5 3.3
THE REMUNERATION/WAS ABLE TO MAKE MONEY/GET PAID	3 2.0
PROFITABILITY/RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI)	2 1.3
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	12 7.9
PROJECTED MARKET SHARE/FUTURE OF PLATFORM	1 0.7
MARKET SHARE WAS GROWING/ BECOMING MORE POPULAR/THEY WERE CAPTURING THE MARKET	4 2.6
IS APP MARKETABLE/IS THERE A NEED/MARKET FOR IT/THE APP	1 0.7
THE GROWTH OF MOBILE APPLICATIONS/WANTED TO GET INTO THE GROWING MOBILE MARKET	4 2.6
THE MARKETPLACE/MARKET CONSIDERATIONS (UNSPEC)	1 0.7
OTHER MARKET GROWTH MENTIONS	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 20

Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	4
	2.6
(LIKE) THE COMPANY/BRAND	2
(APPLE, GOOGLE, ETC)	1.3
THEY ARE MARKET LEADERS/MAJOR	2
COMPETITORS	1.3
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/(CURRENT)	35
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	23.0
HAD THE MOST USERS/BIGGEST	6
MARKET SHARE (AT THE TIME)	3.9
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF	1
USER BASE MENTIONS	0.7
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE	4
(NET)	2.6
TARGET MARKET/DEMOGRAPHIC/WHO IS	1
THE AUDIENCE/CUSTOMER	0.7
(ARE) USERS MORE AFFLUENT/HAVE MORE	1
SPENDING POWER	0.7
HAS A FOCUS ON BUSINESS/BUSINESS	2
USERS	1.3
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	15
	9.9
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	4
	2.6
EASE OF USE/EASE/DIFFICULTY OF	3
DEVELOPMENT	2.0
EASE OF LEARNING LANGUAGE/HOW	1
FAST CAN I LEARN THE SYSTEM/	0.7
LANGUAGE	

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 20

Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	2 1.3
COSTS LESS TO DEVELOP FOR THAT PLATFORM/OPERATING SYSTEM	1 0.7
(IF I) ALREADY HAD THE COMPUTER/ DIDN'T NOT NEED TO GET ANOTHER COMPUTER	1 0.7
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	4 2.6
DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT/IS IT ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS AVAILABLE/WHAT IS THE SDK/API ACCESS	3 2.0
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	7 4.6
FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/ LANGUAGE (SUB-SUBNET)	5 3.3
JAVA (SUB-SUB-SUBNET)	2 1.3
IT'S JAVA/(ANDROID IS) BUILT ON JAVA	1 0.7
EASY TO PICK UP BECAUSE IT'S SIMILAR TO JAVA	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/LANGUAGE	
HAD EXPOSURE TO IT ALREADY/ ALREADY KNEW THE LANGUAGE/ BUILT ON A LANGUAGE I ALREADY KNEW	2 1.3
WORKED (EXCLUSIVELY) ON THAT PLATFORM SINCE SCHOOL/ THROUGHOUT MY CAREER	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 20

Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (OF PLATFORM)/LIKE THE PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	1 0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE MENTIONS	2 1.3
PLATFORM (NET)	9 5.9
THE PLATFORM/WHAT PLATFORM IT'S BUILT ON	2 1.3
OPERATING SYSTEM OF PLATFORM	3 2.0
IT WAS NEW/A NEW PLATFORM/WAS CURIOUS ABOUT PLATFORM	2 1.3
OTHER PLATFORM MENTIONS	2 1.3
DEVICE RELATED (NET)	8 5.3
HAVE/LIKE THE DEVICE (I HAVE AN IPHONE, FAN OF ANDROID PHONES)	6 3.9
WHAT DEVICES THE PLATFORM WAS ON	1 0.7
OTHER DEVICE RELATED MENTIONS	1 0.7
COMMITMENT TO PROJECT (NET)	3 2.0
MARKETING PLANS/HOW WILL IT BE MARKETED	2 1.3
APP STORE/INTERFACE FOR SELLING APP	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 20

Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	1
	0.7
FUNCTIONALITY/PURPOSE OF APPLICATION/WHAT THEY WANT IT TO DO	1
	0.7
FIT MY INTERESTS/LIFESTYLE (NET)	8
	5.3
LOVE/ENJOY PROGRAMMING	2
	1.3
WANTED TO LEARN/STAY FRESH/CURRENT/ KEEP UP WITH TECHNOLOGY/STAY RELEVANT	3
	2.0
SOMETHING THAT I FOUND INTERESTING/ SOMETHING I WANTED TO GET INTO	2
	1.3
OTHER FIT MY INTERESTS/LIFESTYLE MENTIONS	2
	1.3
MISCELLANEOUS	
THE NEEDS OF THE CLIENT/IT WAS MY JOB/CLIENT/COMPANY REQUESTED	20
	13.2
NUMBER OF JOBS AVAILABLE DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS ON THAT PLATFORM	2
	1.3
THE TECHNOLOGY/TECHNOLOGICAL POTENTIAL	1
	0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS MENTIONS	2
	1.3
SECOND FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	59
	38.8
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	22
	14.5
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	22
	14.5

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 20

Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
 ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB-SUBNET)	 5 3.3
THE REMUNERATION/WAS ABLE TO MAKE MONEY/GET PAID	 4 2.6
PROFITABILITY/RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI)	 1 0.7
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	5 3.3
PROJECTED MARKET SHARE/FUTURE OF PLATFORM	 1 0.7
MARKET SHARE WAS GROWING/ BECOMING MORE POPULAR/THEY WERE CAPTURING THE MARKET	 2 1.3
IS APP MARKETABLE/IS THERE A NEED/MARKET FOR IT/THE APP	 1 0.7
THE MARKETPLACE/MARKET CONSIDERATIONS (UNSPEC)	 1 0.7
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	1 0.7
THEY ARE MARKET LEADERS/MAJOR COMPETITORS	 1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/(CURRENT) MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	 7 4.6
HAD THE MOST USERS/BIGGEST MARKET SHARE (AT THE TIME)	 1 0.7
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	 3 2.0
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE (NET)	3 2.0

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 20

Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
(ARE) USERS MORE AFFLUENT/HAVE MORE SPENDING POWER	1 0.7
OTHER DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE MENTIONS	2 1.3
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	15 9.9
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	10 6.6
EASE OF USE/EASE/DIFFICULTY OF DEVELOPMENT	9 5.9
EASE OF LEARNING LANGUAGE/HOW FAST CAN I LEARN THE SYSTEM/ LANGUAGE	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	1 0.7
COSTS LESS TO DEVELOP FOR THAT PLATFORM/OPERATING SYSTEM	1 0.7
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	5 3.3
SUPPORT/RESOURCES AVAILABLE	2 1.3
DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT/IS IT ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY	1 0.7
DOCUMENTATION/AVAILABILITY/ QUALITY OF DOCUMENTATION	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS AVAILABLE/WHAT IS THE SDK/API ACCESS	1 0.7
EXAMPLES/TEST ENVIRONMENTS/OTHER APPLICATIONS I COULD LOOK AT/ LEARN FROM	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 20

Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
OTHER SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT MENTIONS	1 0.7
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	2 1.3
FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/ LANGUAGE (SUB-SUBNET)	2 1.3
MISCELLANEOUS FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/LANGUAGE	
HAD EXPOSURE TO IT ALREADY/ ALREADY KNEW THE LANGUAGE/ BUILT ON A LANGUAGE I ALREADY KNEW	2 1.3
MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES MENTIONS	1 0.7
PLATFORM (NET)	7 4.6
THE PLATFORM/WHAT PLATFORM IT'S BUILT ON	1 0.7
IT WAS NEW/A NEW PLATFORM/WAS CURIOUS ABOUT PLATFORM	2 1.3
SECURITY/SECURE PLATFORM	2 1.3
OTHER PLATFORM MENTIONS	2 1.3
DEVICE RELATED (NET)	7 4.6
HAVE/LIKE THE DEVICE (I HAVE AN IPHONE, FAN OF ANDROID PHONES)	3 2.0
FEATURES OF DEVICE: RESOLUTION, SPEAKERS, ETC.	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 20

Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	3 2.0
OTHER DEVICE RELATED MENTIONS	1 0.7
COMMITMENT TO PROJECT (NET)	2 1.3
APP STORE/INTERFACE FOR SELLING APP	2 1.3
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	2 1.3
USER INTERFACE (UI)/EXPERIENCE	1 0.7
OTHER APPLICATION SPECIFIC MENTIONS	1 0.7
FIT MY INTERESTS/LIFESTYLE (NET)	5 3.3
WANTED TO LEARN/STAY FRESH/CURRENT/ KEEP UP WITH TECHNOLOGY/STAY RELEVANT	4 2.6
OTHER FIT MY INTERESTS/LIFESTYLE MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS	
THE NEEDS OF THE CLIENT/IT WAS MY JOB/CLIENT/COMPANY REQUESTED	4 2.6
NUMBER OF JOBS AVAILABLE DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS ON THAT PLATFORM	1 0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS MENTIONS	1 0.7
THIRD FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	27 17.8

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 20

Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	7 4.6
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	7 4.6
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB- SUBNET)	2 1.3
THE REMUNERATION/WAS ABLE TO MAKE MONEY/GET PAID	1 0.7
PROFITABILITY/RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI)	1 0.7
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	1 0.7
MARKET SHARE WAS GROWING/ BECOMING MORE POPULAR/THEY WERE CAPTURING THE MARKET	1 0.7
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	2 1.3
(LIKE) THE COMPANY/BRAND (APPLE, GOOGLE, ETC)	1 0.7
THEY ARE MARKET LEADERS/MAJOR COMPETITORS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/(CURRENT) MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	1 0.7
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	1 0.7
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE (NET)	2 1.3
(ARE) USERS MORE AFFLUENT/HAVE MORE SPENDING POWER	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 20

Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
OTHER DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	12 7.9
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	3 2.0
EASE OF LEARNING LANGUAGE/HOW FAST CAN I LEARN THE SYSTEM/ LANGUAGE	2 1.3
INTEGRATION/EASE/ABILITY OF ADAPTING CURRENT CODE TO DIFFERENT PLATFORMS	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	1 0.7
(IF I) ALREADY HAD THE COMPUTER/ DIDN'T NOT NEED TO GET ANOTHER COMPUTER	1 0.7
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	5 3.3
SUPPORT/RESOURCES AVAILABLE	2 1.3
DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT/IS IT ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS AVAILABLE/WHAT IS THE SDK/API ACCESS	1 0.7
EXAMPLES/TEST ENVIRONMENTS/OTHER APPLICATIONS I COULD LOOK AT/ LEARN FROM	1 0.7
OTHER SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT MENTIONS	1 0.7
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	2 1.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 20

Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
 FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/ LANGUAGE (SUB-SUBNET)	 2 1.3
 JAVA (SUB-SUB-SUBNET)	 1 0.7
 EASY TO PROGRAM FOR BECAUSE IT'S JAVA/JAVA-BASED	 1 0.7
 MISCELLANEOUS FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/LANGUAGE	
 HAD EXPOSURE TO IT ALREADY/ ALREADY KNEW THE LANGUAGE/ BUILT ON A LANGUAGE I ALREADY KNEW	 1 0.7
 MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	
 OTHER MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE MENTIONS	 1 0.7
 MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	
 OTHER MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES MENTIONS	 1 0.7
 PLATFORM (NET)	 4 2.6
 THE PLATFORM/WHAT PLATFORM IT'S BUILT ON	 1 0.7
 OPERATING SYSTEM OF PLATFORM	 1 0.7
 IT WAS NEW/A NEW PLATFORM/WAS CURIOUS ABOUT PLATFORM	 2 1.3
 OTHER PLATFORM MENTIONS	 1 0.7
 DEVICE RELATED (NET)	 1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 20

Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	1 0.7
COMMITMENT TO PROJECT (NET)	1 0.7
(WHETHER) COMPANY IS/WAS BEHIND PROJECT/PRODUCT	1 0.7
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	2 1.3
FUNCTIONALITY/PURPOSE OF APPLICATION/WHAT THEY WANT IT TO DO	1 0.7
USER INTERFACE (UI)/EXPERIENCE	1 0.7
FOURTH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	8 5.3
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	2 1.3
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	2 1.3
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	2 1.3
THEY ARE MARKET LEADERS/MAJOR COMPETITORS	1 0.7
OTHER COMPANY RELATED MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	2 1.3
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 20

Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
EASE OF LEARNING LANGUAGE/HOW FAST CAN I LEARN THE SYSTEM/ LANGUAGE	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	1 0.7
COSTS LESS TO DEVELOP FOR THAT PLATFORM/OPERATING SYSTEM	1 0.7
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	1 0.7
FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/ LANGUAGE (SUB-SUBNET)	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/LANGUAGE	
WORKED (EXCLUSIVELY) ON THAT PLATFORM SINCE SCHOOL/ THROUGHOUT MY CAREER	1 0.7
PLATFORM (NET)	2 1.3
OTHER PLATFORM MENTIONS	2 1.3
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	1 0.7
USER INTERFACE (UI)/EXPERIENCE	1 0.7
COMPATIBILITY (NET)	1 0.7
OTHER COMPATIBILITY MENTIONS	1 0.7
FIT MY INTERESTS/LIFESTYLE (NET)	1 0.7
LOVE/ENJOY PROGRAMMING	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 20

Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
NONE	1
	0.7
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR APPLE	15
IPHONES OR IPADS AND DID NOT ANSWER	9.9
QUESTION	
HAVE NOT DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR	20
APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS	13.2

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 21

Q.6C ANY OTHER FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LED TO YOUR DECISION TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM? (FIFTH-SEVENTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS	132 86.8
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS AND ANSWERED QUESTION	117 77.0
FIFTH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	20 13.2
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	11 7.2
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	11 7.2
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB- SUBNET)	5 3.3
THE REMUNERATION/WAS ABLE TO MAKE MONEY/GET PAID	4 2.6
PROFITABILITY/RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI)	1 0.7
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	6 3.9
PROJECTED MARKET SHARE/FUTURE OF PLATFORM	1 0.7
MARKET SHARE WAS GROWING/ BECOMING MORE POPULAR/THEY WERE CAPTURING THE MARKET	1 0.7
IS APP MARKETABLE/IS THERE A NEED/MARKET FOR IT/THE APP	1 0.7
THE GROWTH OF MOBILE APPLICATIONS/WANTED TO GET INTO THE GROWING MOBILE MARKET	2 1.3
THE MARKETPLACE/MARKET CONSIDERATIONS (UNSPEC)	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 21

Q.6C ANY OTHER FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LED TO YOUR DECISION TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM? (FIFTH-SEVENTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/(CURRENT)	1
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	0.7
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY	1
DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	0.7
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE (NET)	1 0.7
HAS A FOCUS ON BUSINESS/BUSINESS USERS	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	2 1.3
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	1 0.7
EASE OF USE/EASE/DIFFICULTY OF DEVELOPMENT	1 0.7
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS AVAILABLE/WHAT IS THE SDK/API ACCESS	1 0.7
PLATFORM (NET)	2 1.3
OPERATING SYSTEM OF PLATFORM	1 0.7
SECURITY/SECURE PLATFORM	1 0.7
OTHER PLATFORM MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEVICE RELATED (NET)	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 21

Q.6C ANY OTHER FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LED TO YOUR DECISION TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM? (FIFTH-SEVENTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	1 0.7
COMMITMENT TO PROJECT (NET)	2 1.3
MARKETING PLANS/HOW WILL IT BE MARKETED	1 0.7
OTHER COMMITMENT TO PROJECT MENTIONS	1 0.7
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	2 1.3
USER INTERFACE (UI)/EXPERIENCE	1 0.7
OTHER APPLICATION SPECIFIC MENTIONS	1 0.7
COMPATIBILITY (NET)	1 0.7
OTHER COMPATIBILITY MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS	
THE NEEDS OF THE CLIENT/IT WAS MY JOB/CLIENT/COMPANY REQUESTED	1 0.7
NUMBER OF JOBS AVAILABLE DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS ON THAT PLATFORM	1 0.7
SIXTH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	3 2.0
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE (NET)	1 0.7
HAS A FOCUS ON BUSINESS/BUSINESS USERS	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 21

Q.6C ANY OTHER FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LED TO YOUR DECISION TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM? (FIFTH-SEVENTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	2 1.3
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	1 0.7
OTHER SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT MENTIONS	1 0.7
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	1 0.7
FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/ LANGUAGE (SUB-SUBNET)	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/LANGUAGE	
HAD EXPOSURE TO IT ALREADY/ ALREADY KNEW THE LANGUAGE/ BUILT ON A LANGUAGE I ALREADY KNEW	1 0.7
SEVENTH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	1 0.7
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE (NET)	1 0.7
HAS A FOCUS ON BUSINESS/BUSINESS USERS	1 0.7
NONE	97 63.8
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS AND DID NOT ANSWER QUESTION	15 9.9
HAVE NOT DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS	20 13.2

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 22

Q.6B/6C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LET TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS	132 86.8
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS AND ANSWERED QUESTION	117 77.0
MENTIONED A FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	116 76.3
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	75 49.3
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	75 49.3
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB- SUBNET)	16 10.5
THE REMUNERATION/WAS ABLE TO MAKE MONEY/GET PAID	11 7.2
PROFITABILITY/RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI)	5 3.3
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	21 13.8
PROJECTED MARKET SHARE/FUTURE OF PLATFORM	3 2.0
MARKET SHARE WAS GROWING/ BECOMING MORE POPULAR/THEY WERE CAPTURING THE MARKET	6 3.9
IS APP MARKETABLE/IS THERE A NEED/MARKET FOR IT/THE APP	3 2.0
THE GROWTH OF MOBILE APPLICATIONS/WANTED TO GET INTO THE GROWING MOBILE MARKET	6 3.9
THE MARKETPLACE/MARKET CONSIDERATIONS (UNSPEC)	3 2.0
OTHER MARKET GROWTH MENTIONS	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 22

Q.6B/6C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LET TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	8 5.3
(LIKE) THE COMPANY/BRAND (APPLE, GOOGLE, ETC)	3 2.0
THEY ARE MARKET LEADERS/MAJOR COMPETITORS	4 2.6
OTHER COMPANY RELATED MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/(CURRENT)	40
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	26.3
HAD THE MOST USERS/BIGGEST MARKET SHARE (AT THE TIME)	6 3.9
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	4 2.6
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE (NET)	11 7.2
TARGET MARKET/DEMOGRAPHIC/WHO IS THE AUDIENCE/CUSTOMER	1 0.7
(ARE) USERS MORE AFFLUENT/HAVE MORE SPENDING POWER	3 2.0
HAS A FOCUS ON BUSINESS/BUSINESS USERS	4 2.6
OTHER DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE MENTIONS	3 2.0
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	35 23.0

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 22

Q.6B/6C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LET TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	15 9.9
EASE OF USE/EASE/DIFFICULTY OF DEVELOPMENT	11 7.2
EASE OF LEARNING LANGUAGE/HOW FAST CAN I LEARN THE SYSTEM/ LANGUAGE	5 3.3
INTEGRATION/EASE/ABILITY OF ADAPTING CURRENT CODE TO DIFFERENT PLATFORMS	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	4 2.6
COSTS LESS TO DEVELOP FOR THAT PLATFORM/OPERATING SYSTEM	3 2.0
(IF I) ALREADY HAD THE COMPUTER/ DIDN'T NOT NEED TO GET ANOTHER COMPUTER	2 1.3
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	14 9.2
SUPPORT/RESOURCES AVAILABLE	4 2.6
DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT/IS IT ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY	3 2.0
DOCUMENTATION/AVAILABILITY/ QUALITY OF DOCUMENTATION	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS AVAILABLE/WHAT IS THE SDK/API ACCESS	6 3.9
EXAMPLES/TEST ENVIRONMENTS/OTHER APPLICATIONS I COULD LOOK AT/ LEARN FROM	2 1.3
OTHER SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT MENTIONS	3 2.0

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 22

Q.6B/6C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LET TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	10 6.6
FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/ LANGUAGE (SUB-SUBNET)	8 5.3
JAVA (SUB-SUB-SUBNET)	3 2.0
IT'S JAVA/ (ANDROID IS) BUILT ON JAVA	1 0.7
EASY TO PICK UP BECAUSE IT'S SIMILAR TO JAVA	1 0.7
EASY TO PROGRAM FOR BECAUSE IT'S JAVA/JAVA-BASED	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/LANGUAGE	
HAD EXPOSURE TO IT ALREADY/ ALREADY KNEW THE LANGUAGE/ BUILT ON A LANGUAGE I ALREADY KNEW	5 3.3
WORKED (EXCLUSIVELY) ON THAT PLATFORM SINCE SCHOOL/ THROUGHOUT MY CAREER	2 1.3
MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (OF PLATFORM) /LIKE THE PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	1 0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE MENTIONS	3 2.0
MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS DEVELOPMENT ISSUES MENTIONS	2 1.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 22

Q.6B/6C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LET TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
PLATFORM (NET)	22 14.5
THE PLATFORM/WHAT PLATFORM IT'S BUILT ON	4 2.6
OPERATING SYSTEM OF PLATFORM	5 3.3
IT WAS NEW/A NEW PLATFORM/WAS CURIOUS ABOUT PLATFORM	5 3.3
SECURITY/SECURE PLATFORM	3 2.0
OTHER PLATFORM MENTIONS	8 5.3
DEVICE RELATED (NET)	16 10.5
HAVE/LIKE THE DEVICE (I HAVE AN IPHONE, FAN OF ANDROID PHONES)	9 5.9
WHAT DEVICES THE PLATFORM WAS ON	1 0.7
FEATURES OF DEVICE: RESOLUTION, SPEAKERS, ETC.	1 0.7
NUMBER OF DEVICES/HOW MANY DEVICES USE THAT PLATFORM	4 2.6
OTHER DEVICE RELATED MENTIONS	2 1.3
COMMITMENT TO PROJECT (NET)	8 5.3
MARKETING PLANS/HOW WILL IT BE MARKETED	3 2.0
(WHETHER) COMPANY IS/WAS BEHIND PROJECT/PRODUCT	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 22

Q.6B/6C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LET TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
APP STORE/INTERFACE FOR SELLING APP	3 2.0
OTHER COMMITMENT TO PROJECT MENTIONS	1 0.7
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	7 4.6
FUNCTIONALITY/PURPOSE OF APPLICATION/WHAT THEY WANT IT TO DO	1 0.7
USER INTERFACE (UI)/EXPERIENCE	4 2.6
OTHER APPLICATION SPECIFIC MENTIONS	2 1.3
COMPATIBILITY (NET)	1 0.7
OTHER COMPATIBILITY MENTIONS	1 0.7
FIT MY INTERESTS/LIFESTYLE (NET)	12 7.9
LOVE/ENJOY PROGRAMMING	3 2.0
WANTED TO LEARN/STAY FRESH/CURRENT/ KEEP UP WITH TECHNOLOGY/STAY RELEVANT	6 3.9
SOMETHING THAT I FOUND INTERESTING/ SOMETHING I WANTED TO GET INTO	2 1.3
OTHER FIT MY INTERESTS/LIFESTYLE MENTIONS	2 1.3
MISCELLANEOUS	
THE NEEDS OF THE CLIENT/IT WAS MY JOB/CLIENT/COMPANY REQUESTED	23 15.1

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 22

Q.6B/6C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LET TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
NUMBER OF JOBS AVAILABLE DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS ON THAT PLATFORM	4 2.6
THE TECHNOLOGY/TECHNOLOGICAL POTENTIAL	1 0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS MENTIONS	3 2.0
NONE	1 0.7
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS AND DID NOT ANSWER QUESTION	15 9.9
HAVE NOT DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS	20 13.2

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 23

Q.6A YOU MENTIONED EARLIER THAT YOU HAVE DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR THE BLACKBERRY DEVICES PLATFORM.
AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT YEAR DID YOU START OFFERING APPLICATIONS FOR THE BLACKBERRY DEVICES PLATFORM?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR BLACKBERRY DEVICES	12 7.9
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR BLACKBERRY DEVICES AND ANSWERED QUESTION	7 4.6
2007	1 0.7
2008	1 0.7
2010	2 1.3
2011	1 0.7
2013	1 0.7
2015	1 0.7
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR BLACKBERRY DEVICES AND DID NOT ANSWER QUESTION	5 3.3
HAVE NOT DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR BLACKBERRY DEVICES	140 92.1

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 24

Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE BLACKBERRY DEVICES PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR BLACKBERRY DEVICES	12 7.9
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR BLACKBERRY DEVICES AND ANSWERED QUESTION	7 4.6
FIRST FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	7 4.6
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	2 1.3
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	2 1.3
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/ (CURRENT)	1
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	0.7
HAD THE MOST USERS/BIGGEST MARKET SHARE (AT THE TIME)	1 0.7
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE (NET)	1 0.7
HAS A FOCUS ON BUSINESS/BUSINESS USERS	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	2 1.3
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	1 0.7
INTEGRATION/EASE/ABILITY OF ADAPTING CURRENT CODE TO DIFFERENT PLATFORMS	1 0.7
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 24

Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE BLACKBERRY DEVICES PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (OF	1
PLATFORM)/LIKE THE PROGRAMMING	0.7
LANGUAGE	
COMMITMENT TO PROJECT (NET)	1
	0.7
OTHER COMMITMENT TO PROJECT	1
MENTIONS	0.7
MISCELLANEOUS	
THE NEEDS OF THE CLIENT/IT WAS MY	3
JOB/CLIENT/COMPANY REQUESTED	2.0
SECOND FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	1
	0.7
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE	1
(NET)	0.7
HAS A FOCUS ON BUSINESS/BUSINESS	1
USERS	0.7
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR BLACKBERRY	5
DEVICES AND DID NOT ANSWER QUESTION	3.3
HAVE NOT DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR	140
BLACKBERRY DEVICES	92.1

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 25

Q.6B/6C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LET TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE BLACKBERRY DEVICES PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
 DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR BLACKBERRY DEVICES	 12 7.9
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR BLACKBERRY DEVICES AND ANSWERED QUESTION	7 4.6
MENTIONED A FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	7 4.6
 USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	 2 1.3
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	2 1.3
 MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/ (CURRENT)	1
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	0.7
HAD THE MOST USERS/BIGGEST MARKET SHARE (AT THE TIME)	1 0.7
 DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE (NET)	 2 1.3
HAS A FOCUS ON BUSINESS/BUSINESS USERS	2 1.3
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	2 1.3
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	1 0.7
 INTEGRATION/EASE/ABILITY OF ADAPTING CURRENT CODE TO DIFFERENT PLATFORMS	 1 0.7
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 25

Q.6B/6C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LET TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE BLACKBERRY DEVICES PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (OF	1
PLATFORM)/LIKE THE PROGRAMMING	0.7
LANGUAGE	
COMMITMENT TO PROJECT (NET)	1
	0.7
OTHER COMMITMENT TO PROJECT	1
MENTIONS	0.7
MISCELLANEOUS	
THE NEEDS OF THE CLIENT/IT WAS MY	3
JOB/CLIENT/COMPANY REQUESTED	2.0
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR BLACKBERRY	5
DEVICES AND DID NOT ANSWER QUESTION	3.3
HAVE NOT DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR	140
BLACKBERRY DEVICES	92.1

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 26

Q.6A YOU MENTIONED EARLIER THAT YOU HAVE DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR THE MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS PLATFORM.
AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT YEAR DID YOU START OFFERING APPLICATIONS FOR THE MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS PLATFORM?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS	23 15.1
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS AND ANSWERED QUESTION	12 7.9
2007	1 0.7
2010	1 0.7
2011	3 2.0
2012	1 0.7
2013	3 2.0
2014	2 1.3
2015	1 0.7
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS AND DID NOT ANSWER QUESTION	11 7.2
HAVE NOT DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS	129 84.9

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 27

Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS	23 15.1
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS AND ANSWERED QUESTION	12 7.9
FIRST FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	12 7.9
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	2 1.3
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	2 1.3
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	1 0.7
THE GROWTH OF MOBILE APPLICATIONS/WANTED TO GET INTO THE GROWING MOBILE MARKET	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/(CURRENT)	1
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	0.7
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	2 1.3
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	2 1.3
FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/ LANGUAGE (SUB-SUBNET)	2 1.3
MISCELLANEOUS FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/LANGUAGE	
WORKED (EXCLUSIVELY) ON THAT PLATFORM SINCE SCHOOL/ THROUGHOUT MY CAREER	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 27

Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS	1
FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/ LANGUAGE MENTIONS	0.7
PLATFORM (NET)	1 0.7
OTHER PLATFORM MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEVICE RELATED (NET)	1 0.7
OTHER DEVICE RELATED MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS	
THE NEEDS OF THE CLIENT/IT WAS MY JOB/CLIENT/COMPANY REQUESTED	6 3.9
SECOND FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	7 4.6
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	2 1.3
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	2 1.3
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB- SUBNET)	1 0.7
THE REMUNERATION/WAS ABLE TO MAKE MONEY/GET PAID	1 0.7
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	1 0.7
OTHER COMPANY RELATED MENTIONS	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 27

Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/ (CURRENT)	1
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	0.7
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE (NET)	1 0.7
HAS A FOCUS ON BUSINESS/BUSINESS USERS	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	2 1.3
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	1 0.7
INTEGRATION/EASE/ABILITY OF ADAPTING CURRENT CODE TO DIFFERENT PLATFORMS	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	1 0.7
(IS IT) FREE/NO COST FOR TOOL/ LICENSE	1 0.7
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT (SUBNET)	2 1.3
SUPPORT/RESOURCES AVAILABLE	1 0.7
DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS AVAILABLE/WHAT IS THE SDK/API ACCESS	1 0.7
COMMITMENT TO PROJECT (NET)	1 0.7
(WHETHER) COMPANY IS/WAS BEHIND PROJECT/PRODUCT	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 27

Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	1 0.7
FUNCTIONALITY/PURPOSE OF APPLICATION/WHAT THEY WANT IT TO DO	1 0.7
COMPATIBILITY (NET)	1 0.7
COMPATIBILITY WITH OTHER DEVICES/ OPERATING SYSTEMS/PLATFORMS	1 0.7
FIT MY INTERESTS/LIFESTYLE (NET)	1 0.7
WANTED TO LEARN/STAY FRESH/CURRENT/ KEEP UP WITH TECHNOLOGY/STAY RELEVANT	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS	
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS MENTIONS	1 0.7
THIRD FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	2 1.3
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/POPULARITY/RETURN	
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS USER BASE/ MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/POPULARITY/ RETURN MENTIONS	1 0.7
FIT MY INTERESTS/LIFESTYLE (NET)	1 0.7
WANTED TO LEARN/STAY FRESH/CURRENT/ KEEP UP WITH TECHNOLOGY/STAY RELEVANT	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 27

Q.6B AS BEST AS YOU REMEMBER, WHAT FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS LED TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS PLATFORM? (FIRST-FOURTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS AND DID NOT ANSWER QUESTION	11 7.2
HAVE NOT DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS	129 84.9

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 28

Q.6C ANY OTHER FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LED TO YOUR DECISION TO
DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THE MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS PLATFORM? (FIFTH-SEVENTH FACTORS)

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS	23 15.1
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS AND ANSWERED QUESTION	12 7.9
FIFTH FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	2 1.3
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	1 0.7
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	1 0.7
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	1 0.7
(LIKE) THE COMPANY/BRAND (APPLE, GOOGLE, ETC)	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS	
THE NEEDS OF THE CLIENT/IT WAS MY JOB/CLIENT/COMPANY REQUESTED	1 0.7
NONE	10 6.6
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS AND DID NOT ANSWER QUESTION	11 7.2
HAVE NOT DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS	129 84.9

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 29

Q.6B/6C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LET TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS	23 15.1
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS AND ANSWERED QUESTION	12 7.9
MENTIONED A FACTOR/CONSIDERATION (NET)	12 7.9
USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/ POPULARITY/RETURN (NET)	6 3.9
SIZE OF USER BASE (SUBNET)	5 3.3
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS (SUB- SUBNET)	1 0.7
THE REMUNERATION/WAS ABLE TO MAKE MONEY/GET PAID	1 0.7
MARKET GROWTH (SUB-SUBNET)	1 0.7
THE GROWTH OF MOBILE APPLICATIONS/WANTED TO GET INTO THE GROWING MOBILE MARKET	1 0.7
COMPANY RELATED (SUB-SUBNET)	2 1.3
(LIKE) THE COMPANY/BRAND (APPLE, GOOGLE, ETC)	1 0.7
OTHER COMPANY RELATED MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS SIZE OF USER BASE	
NUMBER OF USERS/ (CURRENT)	2
MARKET SHARE/PENETRATION/DEMAND	1.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 29

Q.6B/6C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LET TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MISCELLANEOUS USER BASE/MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/POPULARITY/RETURN	
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS USER BASE/	1
MARKET SHARE/DEMAND/POPULARITY/	0.7
RETURN MENTIONS	
DEMOGRAPHICS/DESCRIPTION OF USER BASE	1
(NET)	0.7
HAS A FOCUS ON BUSINESS/BUSINESS	1
USERS	0.7
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (NET)	4
	2.6
TIME/EFFORT OF DEVELOPMENT (SUBNET)	1
	0.7
INTEGRATION/EASE/ABILITY OF	1
ADAPTING CURRENT CODE TO	0.7
DIFFERENT PLATFORMS	
DEVELOPMENT COSTS (SUBNET)	1
	0.7
(IS IT) FREE/NO COST FOR TOOL/	1
LICENSE	0.7
SUPPORT/DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT	2
(SUBNET)	1.3
SUPPORT/RESOURCES AVAILABLE	1
	0.7
DEVELOPMENT/INTEGRATION TOOLS	1
AVAILABLE/WHAT IS THE SDK/API	0.7
ACCESS	
PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE (SUBNET)	2
	1.3
FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/	2
LANGUAGE (SUB-SUBNET)	1.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 29

Q.6B/6C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LET TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MISCELLANEOUS FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/LANGUAGE	
WORKED (EXCLUSIVELY) ON THAT PLATFORM SINCE SCHOOL/ THROUGHOUT MY CAREER	1 0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS FAMILIARITY WITH PLATFORM/ LANGUAGE MENTIONS	1 0.7
PLATFORM (NET)	1 0.7
OTHER PLATFORM MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEVICE RELATED (NET)	1 0.7
OTHER DEVICE RELATED MENTIONS	1 0.7
COMMITMENT TO PROJECT (NET)	1 0.7
(WHETHER) COMPANY IS/WAS BEHIND PROJECT/PRODUCT	1 0.7
APPLICATION SPECIFIC (NET)	1 0.7
FUNCTIONALITY/PURPOSE OF APPLICATION/WHAT THEY WANT IT TO DO	1 0.7
COMPATIBILITY (NET)	1 0.7
COMPATIBILITY WITH OTHER DEVICES/ OPERATING SYSTEMS/PLATFORMS	1 0.7
FIT MY INTERESTS/LIFESTYLE (NET)	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 29

Q.6B/6C TOTAL FACTORS OR CONSIDERATIONS THAT LET TO YOUR DECISION TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS
FOR THE MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS PLATFORM (FIRST-SEVENTH FACTORS (NET))

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
WANTED TO LEARN/STAY FRESH/CURRENT/ KEEP UP WITH TECHNOLOGY/STAY RELEVANT	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS	
THE NEEDS OF THE CLIENT/IT WAS MY JOB/CLIENT/COMPANY REQUESTED	7 4.6
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS AND DID NOT ANSWER QUESTION	11 7.2
HAVE NOT DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR MICROSOFT OR NOKIA PHONES OR TABLETS	129 84.9

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 30

Q.7-1A/Q.7-2A SUPPOSE A PLATFORM THAT WAS INTRODUCED A COUPLE OF YEARS AGO, HAS RECENTLY GAINED IN POPULARITY IN TERMS OF NUMBER OF USERS. IN A SITUATION LIKE THAT, HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR CAPABILITY TO LEARN TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT PLATFORM ASSUMING IT REQUIRES USING A NEW AND DIFFERENT PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE THAT YOU HAVE NOT USED BEFORE?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
10 COMPLETELY CAPABLE OF LEARNING TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT PLATFORM	56 36.8
9	20 13.2
8	30 19.7
7	27 17.8
6	5 3.3
5	8 5.3
4	1 0.7
3	0 0
2	1 0.7
1	1 0.7
0 COMPLETELY INCAPABLE OF LEARNING TO DEVELOP APPLICATIONS FOR THAT PLATFORM	3 2.0
MEAN	8.20
STD. DEV.	2.07
STD. ERR.	0.168
MEDIAN	8.5

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 31

Q.7-1B/7-1C/7-2B/7-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 8-10? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
8-10 RATING (Q.7-1A/Q.7-2A)	106 69.7
POSITIVE (GRAND NET)	99 65.1
I AM EXPERIENCED/KNOW/CAN LEARN HOW TO DO THIS (NET)	87 57.2
BACKGROUND/EXPERIENCE (SUBNET)	52 34.2
JAVA EXPERIENCE (SUB-SUBNET)	2 1.3
JUMPED ONTO ANDROID USING JAVA WHEN I WAS A PROFICIENCY PLUS PROGRAMMER	1 0.7
EVERY PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE IS ROUTE AT JAVA SCRIPT AND JAVA	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS BACKGROUND/EXPERIENCE	
MY BACKGROUND/THIS IS WHAT I DO/THIS IS MY JOB/SPECIALTY	14 9.2
I HAVE DONE THIS BEFORE/ ALREADY KNOW HOW TO DO THIS (LEARN NEW LANGUAGES, WRITE NEW LANGUAGES)	17 11.2
LEARN NEW LANGUAGES ALL THE TIME/ALWAYS LEARNING NEW STUFF/HAVE LEARNED MANY LANGUAGES IN THE PAST	18 11.8
I KNOW/HAVE EXPERIENCE WITH MANY/MULTIPLE LANGUAGES/ PLATFORMS	9 5.9
SKILLS/TASKS ARE INTERRELATED (SUBNET)	14 9.2

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 31

Q.7-1B/7-1C/7-2B/7-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 8-10? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
APPLICATION LANGUAGES ARE ALL SIMILAR/ONCE YOU KNOW ONE/SOME/ IT'S EASY/POSSIBLE TO LEARN/ CREATE ANOTHER	13 8.6
CAN IMPLEMENT THE APPLICATION IOC/CAN USE GENERIC/REUSABLE SECTIONS	1 0.7
EVERY PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE IS ROUTE AT JAVA SCRIPT AND JAVA	1 0.7
CAN LEARN HOW TO DO IT (SUBNET)	32 21.1
I CAN LEARN IT/CAN LEARN THE SKILL/LANGUAGE/CAN LEARN NEW SKILLS	22 14.5
I'M A FAST LEARNER/CAN LEARN TO DO THIS QUICKLY	7 4.6
WOULD BE EASY TO LEARN/FIGURE OUT	3 2.0
OTHER CAN LEARN HOW TO DO IT MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS I AM EXPERIENCED/KNOW/CAN LEARN HOW TO DO THIS	
I/WE CAN DO THIS/HAVE THE SKILLS REQUIRED TO DO THIS	5 3.3
I HAVE CONFIDENCE IN MY SKILLS/ NOT A PROBLEM FOR SOMEONE WITH MY SKILL SET/I'M A GOOD PROGRAMMER	12 7.9
SUPPORT/RESOURCES (NET)	11 7.2
THERE WOULD BE (A LOT OF) SUPPORT (EXAMPLES, TUTORIALS, INFORMATION ON THE INTERNET)	4 2.6

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 31

Q.7-1B/7-1C/7-2B/7-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 8-10? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
WOULD HIRE THE RIGHT/BEST PEOPLE/ HAVE A LARGE/DIVERSE TEAM	7 4.6
MISCELLANEOUS POSITIVE	
I LIKE/DON'T MIND (LEARNING) NEW TECHNOLOGY	6 3.9
LIKE/ENJOY PROGRAMMING	4 2.6
HAVE TO BE ABLE TO KEEP UP/ TECHNOLOGY MOVES QUICKLY TODAY	9 5.9
EASY TO USE/DO/NOT TOO DIFFICULT	2 1.3
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS POSITIVE MENTIONS	2 1.3
REASONS NOT TO DO IT (GRAND NET)	2 1.3
WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO LEARN/DO (NET)	2 1.3
IT'S NOT EASY/WOULD BE DIFFICULT	1 0.7
IT WOULD BE HARD TO LEARN/A HUGE LEARNING CURVE	1 0.7
NON-COMMITTAL (GRAND NET)	19 12.5
TIME-RELATED (NET)	4 2.6
DEPENDS ON THE TIME/AS LONG AS I HAVE THE TIME	2 1.3
WOULD TAKE (A LONG) TIME/NOT SOMETHING THAT CAN BE DONE QUICKLY	2 1.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 31

Q.7-1B/7-1C/7-2B/7-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 8-10? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEPENDS ON SPECIFICS OF PROJECT (NET)	4 2.6
DEPENDS ON THE SPECIFICS OF THE PROJECT/WOULD NEED MORE DETAILS TO BE ABLE TO SAY FOR SURE/RATE ACCURATELY	1 0.7
DEPENDS ON THE LANGUAGE	2 1.3
OTHER DEPENDS ON SPECIFICS OF PROJECT MENTIONS	1 0.7
DEPENDS ON SUPPORT/RESOURCES (NET)	6 3.9
DEPENDS ON THE DOCUMENTATION/IF I HAVE (GOOD) DOCUMENTATION	5 3.3
OTHER DEPENDS ON SUPPORT/ RESOURCES MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS NON-COMMITTAL	
DEPENDS IF IT WILL BE WORTHWHILE/ HAVE A FUTURE/IF IT WILL HAVE A USER BASE	3 2.0
DEPENDS ON THE LEVEL OF DIFFICULTY/IF NOT TOO DIFFICULT	3 2.0
DEPENDS ON WHETHER IT IS MODULAR/ BACKWARDS API CAPABILITY	1 0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS NON-COMMITTAL MENTIONS	2 1.3
NOT 8-10 RATING (Q.7-1A/Q.7-2A)	46 30.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 32

Q.7-1B/7-1C/7-2B/7-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 5-7? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
5-7 RATING (Q.7-1A/Q.7-2A)	40 26.3
POSITIVE (GRAND NET)	24 15.8
I AM EXPERIENCED/KNOW/CAN LEARN HOW TO DO THIS (NET)	21 13.8
BACKGROUND/EXPERIENCE (SUBNET)	7 4.6
MISCELLANEOUS BACKGROUND/EXPERIENCE	
I HAVE DONE THIS BEFORE/ ALREADY KNOW HOW TO DO THIS (LEARN NEW LANGUAGES, WRITE NEW LANGUAGES)	2 1.3
LEARN NEW LANGUAGES ALL THE TIME/ALWAYS LEARNING NEW STUFF/HAVE LEARNED MANY LANGUAGES IN THE PAST	3 2.0
I KNOW/HAVE EXPERIENCE WITH MANY/MULTIPLE LANGUAGES/ PLATFORMS	2 1.3
SKILLS/TASKS ARE INTERRELATED (SUBNET)	4 2.6
APPLICATION LANGUAGES ARE ALL SIMILAR/ONCE YOU KNOW ONE/SOME/ IT'S EASY/POSSIBLE TO LEARN/ CREATE ANOTHER	4 2.6
CAN LEARN HOW TO DO IT (SUBNET)	12 7.9
I CAN LEARN IT/CAN LEARN THE SKILL/LANGUAGE/CAN LEARN NEW SKILLS	4 2.6
I'M A FAST LEARNER/CAN LEARN TO DO THIS QUICKLY	4 2.6

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 32

Q.7-1B/7-1C/7-2B/7-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 5-7? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
WOULD BE EASY TO LEARN/FIGURE OUT	5 3.3
MISCELLANEOUS I AM EXPERIENCED/KNOW/CAN LEARN HOW TO DO THIS	
I/WE CAN DO THIS/HAVE THE SKILLS REQUIRED TO DO THIS	3 2.0
I HAVE CONFIDENCE IN MY SKILLS/ NOT A PROBLEM FOR SOMEONE WITH MY SKILL SET/I'M A GOOD PROGRAMMER	1 0.7
SUPPORT/RESOURCES (NET)	3 2.0
THERE WOULD BE (A LOT OF) SUPPORT (EXAMPLES, TUTORIALS, INFORMATION ON THE INTERNET)	2 1.3
WOULD HIRE THE RIGHT/BEST PEOPLE/ HAVE A LARGE/DIVERSE TEAM	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS POSITIVE	
I LIKE/DON'T MIND (LEARNING) NEW TECHNOLOGY	1 0.7
HAVE TO BE ABLE TO KEEP UP/ TECHNOLOGY MOVES QUICKLY TODAY	2 1.3
REASONS NOT TO DO IT (GRAND NET)	9 5.9
HAVE NEVER DONE THIS/NOT IN MY SKILL SET (NET)	2 1.3
NOT REALLY WHAT I DO/NOT THAT EXPERIENCED WITH CODING/NOT A DEVELOPER	1 0.7
DON'T KNOW HOW TO DO THIS/DON'T HAVE THE SKILLS/KNOWLEDGE/ABILITY TO DO THIS	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 32

Q.7-1B/7-1C/7-2B/7-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 5-7? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO LEARN/DO (NET)	6 3.9
IT'S NOT EASY/WOULD BE DIFFICULT	1 0.7
IT WOULD BE HARD TO LEARN/A HUGE LEARNING CURVE	5 3.3
OTHER WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO LEARN/DO MENTIONS (LIST)1	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS REASONS NOT TO DO IT	
DON'T LIKE DOING IT/NOT SOMETHING I WOULD ENJOY	1 0.7
TOO TIME CONSUMING/DON'T HAVE THE TIME TO DO THIS	2 1.3
NON-COMMITTAL (GRAND NET)	15 9.9
TIME-RELATED (NET)	4 2.6
DEPENDS ON THE TIME/AS LONG AS I HAVE THE TIME	2 1.3
WOULD TAKE (A LONG) TIME/NOT SOMETHING THAT CAN BE DONE QUICKLY	2 1.3
DEPENDS ON SPECIFICS OF PROJECT (NET)	8 5.3
DEPENDS ON THE SPECIFICS OF THE PROJECT/WOULD NEED MORE DETAILS TO BE ABLE TO SAY FOR SURE/RATE ACCURATELY	5 3.3
DEPENDS ON THE LANGUAGE	2 1.3
DEPENDS ON THE TYPE OF APPLICATION	2 1.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 32

Q.7-1B/7-1C/7-2B/7-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 5-7? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
OTHER DEPENDS ON SPECIFICS OF PROJECT MENTIONS	2 1.3
DEPENDS ON SUPPORT/RESOURCES (NET)	1 0.7
DEPENDS ON THE DOCUMENTATION/IF I HAVE (GOOD) DOCUMENTATION	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS NON-COMMITTAL	
DEPENDS IF IT WILL BE WORTHWHILE/ HAVE A FUTURE/IF IT WILL HAVE A USER BASE	5 3.3
DEPENDS ON THE LEVEL OF DIFFICULTY/IF NOT TOO DIFFICULT	1 0.7
DON'T KNOW	1 0.7
NOT 5-7 RATING (Q.7-1A/Q.7-2A)	112 73.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 33

Q.7-1B/7-1C/7-2B/7-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 0-4? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
0-4 RATING (Q.7-1A/Q.7-2A)	6 3.9
REASONS NOT TO DO IT (GRAND NET)	4 2.6
HAVE NEVER DONE THIS/NOT IN MY SKILL SET (NET)	3 2.0
HAVE NEVER DONE THIS BEFORE	1 0.7
NOT REALLY WHAT I DO/NOT THAT EXPERIENCED WITH CODING/NOT A DEVELOPER	2 1.3
NOT WORTHWHILE/WOULDN'T BOTHER (NET)	1 0.7
ALREADY SO MANY/TOO MANY LANGUAGES OUT THERE	1 0.7
NON-COMMITTAL (GRAND NET)	2 1.3
DEPENDS ON SPECIFICS OF PROJECT (NET)	1 0.7
DEPENDS ON THE LANGUAGE	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS NON-COMMITTAL	
DEPENDS IF IT WILL BE WORTHWHILE/ HAVE A FUTURE/IF IT WILL HAVE A USER BASE	1 0.7
DEPENDS ON THE LEVEL OF DIFFICULTY/IF NOT TOO DIFFICULT	1 0.7
DEPENDS ON WHETHER IT IS MODULAR/ BACKWARDS API CAPABILITY	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 33

Q.7-1B/7-1C/7-2B/7-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 0-4? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
NOT 0-4 RATING (Q.7-1A/Q.7-2A)	146 96.1

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 34

Q.8-1A/Q.8-2A PLEASE RATE YOUR CAPABILITY TO DEVELOP AND ESTABLISH A COMPLETELY
NEW PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE IN THE MARKET FOR USE IN MOBILE APPLICATIONS THAT IS
DIFFERENT FROM ALL EXISTING PROGRAMMING LANGUAGES.

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
10 COMPLETELY CAPABLE OF DEVELOPING AND ESTABLISHING A NEW PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE FOR MOBILE APPLICATIONS THAT IS DIFFERENT FROM ALL EXISTING PROGRAMMING LANGUAGES	10 6.6
9	7 4.6
8	21 13.8
7	23 15.1
6	5 3.3
5	27 17.8
4	16 10.5
3	8 5.3
2	7 4.6
1	6 3.9
0 COMPLETELY INCAPABLE OF DEVELOPING AND ESTABLISHING A NEW PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE FOR MOBILE APPLICATIONS THAT IS DIFFERENT FROM ALL EXISTING PROGRAMMING LANGUAGES	22 14.5
MEAN	5.03
STD. DEV.	3.05
STD. ERR.	0.247
MEDIAN	4.6

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 35

Q.8-1B/8-1C/8-2B/8-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 8-10? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
8-10 RATING (Q.8-1A/Q.8-2A)	38 25.0
POSITIVE (GRAND NET)	34 22.4
I AM EXPERIENCED/KNOW/CAN LEARN HOW TO DO THIS (NET)	32 21.1
BACKGROUND/EXPERIENCE (SUBNET)	17 11.2
JAVA EXPERIENCE (SUB-SUBNET)	2 1.3
I WAS A PROJECT MANAGER AT MICRO SYSTEMS DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF JAVA	1 0.7
WE'VE SWITCHED OUR LANGUAGE TO SWIFT AND SWITCHED FROM JAVA TO KOTLIN	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS BACKGROUND/EXPERIENCE	
MY BACKGROUND/THIS IS WHAT I DO/THIS IS MY JOB/SPECIALTY	7 4.6
I HAVE DONE THIS BEFORE/ ALREADY KNOW HOW TO DO THIS (LEARN NEW LANGUAGES, WRITE NEW LANGUAGES)	6 3.9
LEARN NEW LANGUAGES ALL THE TIME/ALWAYS LEARNING NEW STUFF/HAVE LEARNED MANY LANGUAGES IN THE PAST	2 1.3
I KNOW/HAVE EXPERIENCE WITH MANY/MULTIPLE LANGUAGES/ PLATFORMS	5 3.3
SKILLS/TASKS ARE INTERRELATED (SUBNET)	6 3.9

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 35

Q.8-1B/8-1C/8-2B/8-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 8-10? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
APPLICATION LANGUAGES ARE ALL SIMILAR/ONCE YOU KNOW ONE/SOME/ IT'S EASY/POSSIBLE TO LEARN/ CREATE ANOTHER	5 3.3
OTHER SKILLS/TASKS ARE INTERRELATED MENTIONS	1 0.7
CAN LEARN HOW TO DO IT (SUBNET)	6 3.9
I CAN LEARN IT/CAN LEARN THE SKILL/LANGUAGE/CAN LEARN NEW SKILLS	5 3.3
I'M A FAST LEARNER/CAN LEARN TO DO THIS QUICKLY	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS I AM EXPERIENCED/KNOW/CAN LEARN HOW TO DO THIS	
I/WE CAN DO THIS/HAVE THE SKILLS REQUIRED TO DO THIS	6 3.9
I HAVE CONFIDENCE IN MY SKILLS/ NOT A PROBLEM FOR SOMEONE WITH MY SKILL SET/I'M A GOOD PROGRAMMER	6 3.9
SUPPORT/RESOURCES (NET)	1 0.7
WOULD HIRE THE RIGHT/BEST PEOPLE/ HAVE A LARGE/DIVERSE TEAM	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS POSITIVE	
I LIKE/DON'T MIND (LEARNING) NEW TECHNOLOGY	2 1.3
HAVE TO BE ABLE TO KEEP UP/ TECHNOLOGY MOVES QUICKLY TODAY	2 1.3
EASY TO USE/DO/NOT TOO DIFFICULT	2 1.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 35

Q.8-1B/8-1C/8-2B/8-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 8-10? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS POSITIVE MENTIONS	1 0.7
REASONS NOT TO DO IT (GRAND NET)	3 2.0
NOT WORTHWHILE/WOULDN'T BOTHER (NET)	1 0.7
ALREADY SO MANY/TOO MANY LANGUAGES OUT THERE	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS REASONS NOT TO DO IT	
TOO TIME CONSUMING/DON'T HAVE THE TIME TO DO THIS	1 0.7
REQUIRES MORE RESOURCES THAN I HAVE/WOULD NEED A WHOLE TEAM	1 0.7
NON-COMMITTAL (GRAND NET)	6 3.9
TIME-RELATED (NET)	1 0.7
DEPENDS ON THE TIME/AS LONG AS I HAVE THE TIME	1 0.7
DEPENDS ON SPECIFICS OF PROJECT (NET)	4 2.6
DEPENDS ON THE SPECIFICS OF THE PROJECT/WOULD NEED MORE DETAILS TO BE ABLE TO SAY FOR SURE/RATE ACCURATELY	2 1.3
IF THE LANGUAGE IS USER-FRIENDLY LIKE JAVA	1 0.7
OTHER DEPENDS ON SPECIFICS OF PROJECT MENTIONS	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 35

Q.8-1B/8-1C/8-2B/8-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 8-10? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MISCELLANEOUS NON-COMMITTAL	
DEPENDS IF IT WILL BE WORTHWHILE/ HAVE A FUTURE/IF IT WILL HAVE A USER BASE	1 0.7
DEPENDS ON THE LEVEL OF DIFFICULTY/IF NOT TOO DIFFICULT	1 0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS NON-COMMITTAL MENTIONS	1 0.7
NOT 8-10 RATING (Q.8-1A/Q.8-2A)	114 75.0

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 36

Q.8-1B/8-1C/8-2B/8-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 5-7? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
5-7 RATING (Q.8-1A/Q.8-2A)	55 36.2
POSITIVE (GRAND NET)	30 19.7
I AM EXPERIENCED/KNOW/CAN LEARN HOW TO DO THIS (NET)	24 15.8
BACKGROUND/EXPERIENCE (SUBNET)	14 9.2
JAVA EXPERIENCE (SUB-SUBNET)	1 0.7
HAVE EXPERIENCE WITH JAVA	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS BACKGROUND/EXPERIENCE	
MY BACKGROUND/THIS IS WHAT I DO/THIS IS MY JOB/SPECIALTY	5 3.3
I HAVE DONE THIS BEFORE/ ALREADY KNOW HOW TO DO THIS (LEARN NEW LANGUAGES, WRITE NEW LANGUAGES)	7 4.6
I KNOW/HAVE EXPERIENCE WITH MANY/MULTIPLE LANGUAGES/ PLATFORMS	2 1.3
SKILLS/TASKS ARE INTERRELATED (SUBNET)	7 4.6
APPLICATION LANGUAGES ARE ALL SIMILAR/ONCE YOU KNOW ONE/SOME/ IT'S EASY/POSSIBLE TO LEARN/ CREATE ANOTHER	7 4.6
CAN LEARN HOW TO DO IT (SUBNET)	7 4.6
I CAN LEARN IT/CAN LEARN THE SKILL/LANGUAGE/CAN LEARN NEW SKILLS	5 3.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 36

Q.8-1B/8-1C/8-2B/8-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 5-7? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
I'M A FAST LEARNER/CAN LEARN TO DO THIS QUICKLY	2 1.3
MISCELLANEOUS I AM EXPERIENCED/KNOW/CAN LEARN HOW TO DO THIS	
I/WE CAN DO THIS/HAVE THE SKILLS REQUIRED TO DO THIS	2 1.3
I HAVE CONFIDENCE IN MY SKILLS/NOT A PROBLEM FOR SOMEONE WITH MY SKILL SET/I'M A GOOD PROGRAMMER	4 2.6
SUPPORT/RESOURCES (NET)	1 0.7
WOULD HIRE THE RIGHT/BEST PEOPLE/HAVE A LARGE/DIVERSE TEAM	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS POSITIVE	
I LIKE/DON'T MIND (LEARNING) NEW TECHNOLOGY	2 1.3
LIKE/ENJOY PROGRAMMING	1 0.7
EASY TO USE/DO/NOT TOO DIFFICULT	3 2.0
IT'S POSSIBLE/COULD BE DONE GIVEN THE RIGHT CIRCUMSTANCES	4 2.6
REASONS NOT TO DO IT (GRAND NET)	22 14.5
HAVE NEVER DONE THIS/NOT IN MY SKILL SET (NET)	8 5.3
HAVE NEVER DONE THIS BEFORE	3 2.0
NOT REALLY WHAT I DO/NOT THAT EXPERIENCED WITH CODING/NOT A DEVELOPER	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 36

Q.8-1B/8-1C/8-2B/8-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 5-7? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DON'T KNOW HOW TO DO THIS/DON'T HAVE THE SKILLS/KNOWLEDGE/ABILITY TO DO THIS	3 2.0
REQUIRES INTERACTION WITH THE HARDWARE DEVICE/KNOWLEDGE ABOUT HARDWARE THAT I DON'T HAVE	3 2.0
ONLY KNOW HOW TO WORK WITH (MULTIPLE) EXISTING LANGUAGES	1 0.7
WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO LEARN/DO (NET)	9 5.9
IT'S NOT EASY/WOULD BE DIFFICULT	5 3.3
IT WOULD BE HARD TO LEARN/A HUGE LEARNING CURVE	2 1.3
DEVELOPING A (NEW) LANGUAGE IS DIFFERENT/HARDER/MORE COMPLICATED THAN MERELY USING A LANGUAGE	2 1.3
OTHER WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO LEARN/DO MENTIONS (LIST)1	1 0.7
NOT WORTHWHILE/WOULDN'T BOTHER (NET)	3 2.0
NOT A WORTHWHILE ENDEAVOR/ WOULDN'T RELATE TO ANYTHING/NO BENEFIT IN LEARNING/CREATING LANGUAGE	2 1.3
ALREADY SO MANY/TOO MANY LANGUAGES OUT THERE	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS REASONS NOT TO DO IT	
DON'T WANT TO DO THIS/NO INTEREST	2 1.3
DON'T LIKE DOING IT/NOT SOMETHING I WOULD ENJOY	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 36

Q.8-1B/8-1C/8-2B/8-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 5-7? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
WOULD BE A LOT OF WORK	1 0.7
TOO TIME CONSUMING/DON'T HAVE THE TIME TO DO THIS	4 2.6
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS REASONS NOT TO DO IT MENTIONS	3 2.0
NON-COMMITTAL (GRAND NET)	23 15.1
TIME-RELATED (NET)	7 4.6
DEPENDS ON THE TIME/AS LONG AS I HAVE THE TIME	4 2.6
WOULD TAKE (A LONG) TIME/NOT SOMETHING THAT CAN BE DONE QUICKLY	3 2.0
DEPENDS ON SPECIFICS OF PROJECT (NET)	8 5.3
DEPENDS ON THE SPECIFICS OF THE PROJECT/WOULD NEED MORE DETAILS TO BE ABLE TO SAY FOR SURE/RATE ACCURATELY	4 2.6
DEPENDS ON THE LANGUAGE	3 2.0
DEPENDS ON THE TYPE OF APPLICATION	2 1.3
DEPENDS ON SUPPORT/RESOURCES (NET)	4 2.6
I WOULD NEED HELP/DEPENDS ON THE HELP/SUPPORT I CAN GET	4 2.6
OTHER DEPENDS ON SUPPORT/ RESOURCES MENTIONS	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 36

Q.8-1B/8-1C/8-2B/8-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 5-7? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MISCELLANEOUS NON-COMMITTAL	
DEPENDS IF IT WILL BE WORTHWHILE/ HAVE A FUTURE/IF IT WILL HAVE A USER BASE	2 1.3
DEPENDS ON THE LEVEL OF DIFFICULTY/IF NOT TOO DIFFICULT	1 0.7
WOULD BE NEW TO ME/HARD TO SAY SINCE I HAVEN'T DONE IT BEFORE	2 1.3
WOULDN'T BE 100% READY/KNOW HOW TO DO IT UP TO A LIMIT	1 0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS NON-COMMITTAL MENTIONS	4 2.6
NOT 5-7 RATING (Q.8-1A/Q.8-2A)	97 63.8

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 37

Q.8-1B/8-1C/8-2B/8-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 0-4? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
0-4 RATING (Q.8-1A/Q.8-2A)	59 38.8
POSITIVE (GRAND NET)	9 5.9
I AM EXPERIENCED/KNOW/CAN LEARN HOW TO DO THIS (NET)	5 3.3
BACKGROUND/EXPERIENCE (SUBNET)	2 1.3
MISCELLANEOUS BACKGROUND/EXPERIENCE	
MY BACKGROUND/THIS IS WHAT I DO/THIS IS MY JOB/SPECIALTY	1 0.7
I HAVE DONE THIS BEFORE/ ALREADY KNOW HOW TO DO THIS (LEARN NEW LANGUAGES, WRITE NEW LANGUAGES)	1 0.7
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS BACKGROUND/EXPERIENCE MENTIONS	1 0.7
CAN LEARN HOW TO DO IT (SUBNET)	1 0.7
I CAN LEARN IT/CAN LEARN THE SKILL/LANGUAGE/CAN LEARN NEW SKILLS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS I AM EXPERIENCED/KNOW/CAN LEARN HOW TO DO THIS	
I/WE CAN DO THIS/HAVE THE SKILLS REQUIRED TO DO THIS	1 0.7
I HAVE CONFIDENCE IN MY SKILLS/ NOT A PROBLEM FOR SOMEONE WITH MY SKILL SET/I'M A GOOD PROGRAMMER	1 0.7
SUPPORT/RESOURCES (NET)	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 37

Q.8-1B/8-1C/8-2B/8-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 0-4? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
WOULD HIRE THE RIGHT/BEST PEOPLE/ HAVE A LARGE/DIVERSE TEAM	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS POSITIVE	
IT'S POSSIBLE/COULD BE DONE GIVEN THE RIGHT CIRCUMSTANCES	4 2.6
REASONS NOT TO DO IT (GRAND NET)	51 33.6
HAVE NEVER DONE THIS/NOT IN MY SKILL SET (NET)	35 23.0
HAVE NEVER DONE THIS BEFORE	8 5.3
NOT REALLY WHAT I DO/NOT THAT EXPERIENCED WITH CODING/NOT A DEVELOPER	14 9.2
DON'T KNOW HOW TO DO THIS/DON'T HAVE THE SKILLS/KNOWLEDGE/ABILITY TO DO THIS	13 8.6
REQUIRES INTERACTION WITH THE HARDWARE DEVICE/KNOWLEDGE ABOUT HARDWARE THAT I DON'T HAVE	2 1.3
ONLY KNOW HOW TO WORK WITH (MULTIPLE) EXISTING LANGUAGES	1 0.7
WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO LEARN/DO (NET)	11 7.2
IT'S NOT EASY/WOULD BE DIFFICULT	2 1.3
IT WOULD BE HARD TO LEARN/A HUGE LEARNING CURVE	1 0.7
DEVELOPING A (NEW) LANGUAGE IS DIFFERENT/HARDER/MORE COMPLICATED THAN MERELY USING A LANGUAGE	8 5.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 37

Q.8-1B/8-1C/8-2B/8-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 0-4? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
NOT WORTHWHILE/WOULDN'T BOTHER (NET)	9 5.9
HAVE OTHER/MORE IMPORTANT THINGS TO FOCUS ON/BETTER WAYS TO SPEND MY TIME	1 0.7
NOT A WORTHWHILE ENDEAVOR/ WOULDN'T RELATE TO ANYTHING/NO BENEFIT IN LEARNING/CREATING LANGUAGE	2 1.3
DON'T SEE THE POINT OF INVENTING NEW A LANGUAGE/BETTER TO USE AN EXISTING LANGUAGE/SEEMS LIKE REINVENTING THE WHEEL	6 3.9
ALREADY SO MANY/TOO MANY LANGUAGES OUT THERE	1 0.7
OTHER NOT WORTHWHILE/WOULDN'T BOTHER MENTIONS	1 0.7
MISCELLANEOUS REASONS NOT TO DO IT	
DON'T WANT TO DO THIS/NO INTEREST	6 3.9
WOULD BE A LOT OF WORK	3 2.0
TOO TIME CONSUMING/DON'T HAVE THE TIME TO DO THIS	5 3.3
REQUIRES MORE RESOURCES THAN I HAVE/WOULD NEED A WHOLE TEAM	4 2.6
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS REASONS NOT TO DO IT MENTIONS	1 0.7
NON-COMMITTAL (GRAND NET)	8 5.3
TIME-RELATED (NET)	1 0.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 37

Q.8-1B/8-1C/8-2B/8-2C WHAT MAKES YOU GIVE A RATING OF 0-4? ANY OTHER REASON?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
WOULD TAKE (A LONG) TIME/NOT SOMETHING THAT CAN BE DONE QUICKLY	1 0.7
DEPENDS ON SPECIFICS OF PROJECT (NET)	3 2.0
DEPENDS ON THE SPECIFICS OF THE PROJECT/WOULD NEED MORE DETAILS TO BE ABLE TO SAY FOR SURE/RATE ACCURATELY	3 2.0
MISCELLANEOUS NON-COMMITTAL	
WOULD BE NEW TO ME/HARD TO SAY SINCE I HAVEN'T DONE IT BEFORE	3 2.0
WOULDN'T BE 100% READY/KNOW HOW TO DO IT UP TO A LIMIT	1 0.7
NOT 0-4 RATING (Q.8-1A/Q.8-2A)	93 61.2

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 38

Q.9-1/Q.9-2 IN GENERAL, BASED ON YOUR PRIOR EXPERIENCE IN DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS FOR
MOBILE PLATFORMS, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FOLLOWING SIX FACTORS WHEN
DECIDING TO COMMIT RESOURCES TO DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS FOR A PARTICULAR MOBILE PLATFORM?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
THE NUMBER OF USERS OR DEVICES ALREADY USING THE PLATFORM	
10 EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	70 46.1
9	21 13.8
8	34 22.4
7	10 6.6
6	4 2.6
5	8 5.3
4	1 0.7
3	2 1.3
2	0 0
1	0 0
0 NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	2 1.3
MEAN	8.59
STD. DEV.	1.89
STD. ERR.	0.154
MEDIAN	8.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 38

Q.9-1/Q.9-2 IN GENERAL, BASED ON YOUR PRIOR EXPERIENCE IN DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS FOR
MOBILE PLATFORMS, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FOLLOWING SIX FACTORS WHEN
DECIDING TO COMMIT RESOURCES TO DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS FOR A PARTICULAR MOBILE PLATFORM?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
YOUR PRIOR FAMILIARITY WITH THE PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE USED BY THE PLATFORM	
10 EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	27
	17.8
9	10
	6.6
8	30
	19.7
7	19
	12.5
6	15
	9.9
5	28
	18.4
4	4
	2.6
3	9
	5.9
2	3
	2.0
1	0
	0
0 NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	7
	4.6
MEAN	6.66
STD. DEV.	2.60
STD. ERR.	0.211
MEDIAN	6.5

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 38

Q.9-1/Q.9-2 IN GENERAL, BASED ON YOUR PRIOR EXPERIENCE IN DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS FOR
MOBILE PLATFORMS, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FOLLOWING SIX FACTORS WHEN
DECIDING TO COMMIT RESOURCES TO DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS FOR A PARTICULAR MOBILE PLATFORM?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
THE EASE OR DIFFICULTY OF GETTING NEW APPLICATIONS APPROVED FOR SALE BY THE PLATFORM OWNER	
10 EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	28
	18.4
9	21
	13.8
8	31
	20.4
7	22
	14.5
6	8
	5.3
5	26
	17.1
4	3
	2.0
3	5
	3.3
2	4
	2.6
1	1
	0.7
0 NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	3
	2.0
MEAN	7.14
STD. DEV.	2.39
STD. ERR.	0.194
MEDIAN	7.1

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 38

Q.9-1/Q.9-2 IN GENERAL, BASED ON YOUR PRIOR EXPERIENCE IN DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS FOR
MOBILE PLATFORMS, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FOLLOWING SIX FACTORS WHEN
DECIDING TO COMMIT RESOURCES TO DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS FOR A PARTICULAR MOBILE PLATFORM?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
THE PERCENTAGE OF REVENUE FROM PURCHASES OF THE APPLICATION RETAINED BY THE PLATFORM OWNER	
10 EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	35 23.0
9	17 11.2
8	35 23.0
7	23 15.1
6	12 7.9
5	15 9.9
4	5 3.3
3	1 0.7
2	1 0.7
1	0 0
0 NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	8 5.3
MEAN	7.34
STD. DEV.	2.51
STD. ERR.	0.203
MEDIAN	7.3

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 38

Q.9-1/Q.9-2 IN GENERAL, BASED ON YOUR PRIOR EXPERIENCE IN DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS FOR
MOBILE PLATFORMS, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FOLLOWING SIX FACTORS WHEN
DECIDING TO COMMIT RESOURCES TO DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS FOR A PARTICULAR MOBILE PLATFORM?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
THE BRAND STRENGTH AND MARKETING RESOURCES OF THE PLATFORM OWNER	
10 EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	32
	21.1
9	18
	11.8
8	43
	28.3
7	22
	14.5
6	10
	6.6
5	13
	8.6
4	5
	3.3
3	4
	2.6
2	1
	0.7
1	1
	0.7
0 NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	3
	2.0
MEAN	7.50
STD. DEV.	2.22
STD. ERR.	0.180
MEDIAN	7.4

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 38

Q.9-1/Q.9-2 IN GENERAL, BASED ON YOUR PRIOR EXPERIENCE IN DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS FOR
MOBILE PLATFORMS, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FOLLOWING SIX FACTORS WHEN
DECIDING TO COMMIT RESOURCES TO DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS FOR A PARTICULAR MOBILE PLATFORM?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
WHETHER THE PLATFORM AT ISSUE IS AN OPEN OR CLOSED ECOSYSTEM	
10 EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	21
	13.8
9	15
	9.9
8	23
	15.1
7	14
	9.2
6	11
	7.2
5	32
	21.1
4	6
	3.9
3	9
	5.9
2	6
	3.9
1	1
	0.7
0 NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	14
	9.2
MEAN	6.03
STD. DEV.	2.98
STD. ERR.	0.242
MEDIAN	5.7

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 39

Q.10A HAVE YOU OR YOUR FIRM DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR IOS WRITTEN IN THE OBJECTIVE-C LANGUAGE?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS	132 86.8
YES	110 72.4
NO	19 12.5
DON'T KNOW	3 2.0
HAVE NOT DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS	20 13.2

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 40

Q.10B PRIOR TO DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS FOR IOS, DID YOU KNOW THE OBJECTIVE-C PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE,
DID YOU HAVE TO LEARN IT, OR DID YOU HIRE AN EXPERIENCED OBJECTIVE-C DEVELOPER TO DEVELOP FOR IOS?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS	132 86.8
YES, HAVE DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR IOS WRITTEN IN THE OBJECTIVE-C LANGUAGE	110 72.4
YOU KNEW THE OBJECTIVE-C PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE, OR	16 10.5
YOU HAD TO LEARN THE OBJECTIVE-C PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE, OR	79 52.0
YOU HIRED AN EXPERIENCED OBJECTIVE-C DEVELOPER TO DEVELOP FOR IOS	13 8.6
DON'T KNOW	2 1.3
NO, HAVE NOT DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR IOS WRITTEN IN THE OBJECTIVE-C LANGUAGE	19 12.5
DON'T KNOW	3 2.0
HAVE NOT DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS	20 13.2

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 41

Q.11 OVER THE PAST TWO YEARS, APPLE HAS INTRODUCED AND UPDATED A NEW PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE CALLED SWIFT.
DO YOU OR DON'T YOU PLAN TO LEARN SWIFT FOR YOUR APPLICATIONS DEVELOPMENT WORK FOR IOS?

	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR APPLE	132
IPHONES OR IPADS	86.8
YES, HAVE DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR	110
IOS WRITTEN IN THE OBJECTIVE-C LANGUAGE	72.4
YES, I DO	89
	58.6
NO, I DON'T	18
	11.8
DON'T KNOW	3
	2.0
NO, HAVE NOT DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR	19
IOS WRITTEN IN THE OBJECTIVE-C LANGUAGE	12.5
DON'T KNOW	3
	2.0
HAVE NOT DEVELOPED APPLICATIONS FOR	20
APPLE IPHONES OR IPADS	13.2

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 42

Q.11A IN GENERAL, DO YOU MAKE DECISIONS ABOUT WHICH APPLICATIONS
TO DEVELOP INDEPENDENTLY, OR AS PART OF A TEAM OF APPLICATION DEVELOPERS?

	TOTAL -----
BASE: TOTAL ASKED QUESTION	129
INDEPENDENTLY	28 21.7
AS PART OF A TEAM OF APPLICATION DEVELOPERS	67 51.9
BOTH, SOMETIMES INDEPENDENTLY AND SOMETIMES AS PART OF A TEAM OF APPLICATION DEVELOPERS	34 26.4

TARGET RESEARCH GROUP INC.
APPLICATION DEVELOPERS STUDY (#103-15151)

Table 43

GENDER	
	TOTAL

BASE: TOTAL RESPONDENTS	152
MALE	135
	88.8
FEMALE	17
	11.2
DON'T KNOW	0
	0

EXHIBIT G

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
KAREN G. JOHNSON-MCKEWAN (SBN 121570)
kjohnson-mckewan@orrick.com
ANNETTE L. HURST (SBN 148738)
ahurst@orrick.com
GABRIEL M. RAMSEY (SBN 209218)
gramsey@orrick.com
405 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 1.415.773.5700 / Fax: 1.415.773.5759
PETER A. BICKS (*pro hac vice*)
pbicks@orrick.com
LISA T. SIMPSON (*pro hac vice*)
lsimpson@orrick.com
51 West 52nd Street, New York, NY 10019
Tel: 1.212.506.5000 / Fax: 1.212.506.5151

BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
DAVID BOIES (*pro hac vice*)
dboies@bsflp.com
333 Main Street, Armonk, NY 10504
Tel: 1.914.749.8200 / Fax: 1.914.749.8300
STEVEN C. HOLTZMAN (SBN 144177)
sholtzman@bsflp.com
1999 Harrison St., Ste. 900, Oakland, CA 94612
Tel: 1.510.874.1000 / Fax: 1.510.874.1460

ORACLE CORPORATION
DORIAN DALEY (SBN 129049)
dorian.daley@oracle.com
DEBORAH K. MILLER (SBN 95527)
deborah.miller@oracle.com
MATTHEW M. SARBORARIA (SBN 211600)
matthew.sarboraria@oracle.com
RUCHIKA AGRAWAL (SBN 246058)
ruchika.agrawal@oracle.com
500 Oracle Parkway,
Redwood City, CA 94065
Tel: 650.506.5200 / Fax: 650.506.7117

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ORACLE AMERICA, INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.
Plaintiff,
v.
GOOGLE INC.
Defendant.

Case No. CV 10-03561 WHA
**EXHIBITS D, G, AND I TO EXHIBIT 9
TO THE DECLARATION OF
ANDREW D. SILVERMAN**

Hearing: April 27, 2016, 8:00 a.m.
Dept.: Courtroom 8, 19th Floor
Judge: Honorable William H. Alsup

MANUAL FILING NOTIFICATION

Regarding: Manually Filed Portions of Exhibit 9 to the Declaration of Andrew D. Silverman in Support of Oracle's Motions in Limine

This filing is in physical form only, and is being maintained in the case file in the Clerk's office. If you are a participant on this case, this filing will be served shortly.

For information on retrieving this filing directly from the Court, please see the Court's main web site at <http://www.cand.uscourts.gov> under Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ).

This filing was not efiled for the following reason(s):

☐ Unable to Scan Documents

☐ Physical Object (please describe):

☐ Non-Graphic/Text Computer File (audio, video, etc.) on CD or other media

☐ Item Under Seal in Criminal Case

☐ Conformance with the Judicial Conference Privacy Policy (General Order 53)

☒ Other (please describe): Exhibits D, G, and I to the Expert Report of Dr. Itamar Simonson, attached as Exhibit 9 to the Declaration of Andrew D. Silverman, are Microsoft Excel spreadsheets containing a significant amount of data in many cells across multiple sheets. If printed or converted to a PDF file, the documents would span many pages and would be unwieldy to use.

Dated: March 23, 2016

ORRICK, HERRINGTON &
SUTCLIFFE LLP

By: 

ANDREW D. SILVERMAN

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ORACLE AMERICA, INC.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within-entitled action. My business address is Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP, 1000 Marsh Road, Menlo Park, California 94025. On March 23, 2016, I served the following document(s):

**NOTICE OF MANUAL FILING RE: PORTIONS OF
EXHIBIT 9 TO THE DECLARATION OF ANDREW D.
SILVERMAN IN SUPPORT OF ORACLE'S MOTIONS IN
LIMINE**

**MANUALLY FILED PORTIONS OF EXHIBIT 9 TO THE
DECLARATION OF ANDREW D. SILVERMAN**

on the interested parties in this action by electronic service [Fed. Rule Civ. Proc. 5(b)] by electronically mailing true and correct copies to: DALVIK@kvn.com

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on March 23, 2016, at San Francisco, California.



José E. Valdés

PROOF OF SERVICE

January 26, 2016

Q15/6 Series Factors/Considerations
Q4A/4B Things would want to know about platform

User Base/Market Share/Demand/Popularity/Return (Net)**Size of User Base (SubNet)****Economic Considerations (Sub-SubNet)**

- 001 The remuneration/was able to make money/get paid
- 002 Profitability/return on investment (ROI)
- 003 Other Economic Considerations Mentions (List)

Market Growth (Sub-SubNet)

- 004 Adoption rate
- 005 Projected market share/future of platform
- 006 Market share was growing/becoming more popular/they were capturing the market
- 007 Is app marketable/is there a need/market for it/the app
- 008 Where does it fit in the current market/to see what's already in the market/is this a new app/idea
- 009 The growth of mobile applications/wanted to get into the growing mobile market
- 010 The marketplace/market considerations (Unspec)
- 011 Java is the fastest growing language in the world [DN w/ Java]
- 013 Other Market Growth Mentions (List)

Company Related (Sub-SubNet)

- 014 What company is behind the platform
- 015 (Like) The company/brand (Apple, Google, etc)
- 016 They are market leaders/major competitors
- 017 Other Company Related Mentions (List)

Miscellaneous Size of User Base

- 018 Number of users/(current) market share/penetration/demand [this code already checked]
- 019 Had the most users/biggest market share (at the time)
- 020 Number of devices/how many devices use that platform [DN w/ Device Related]
- 021 Other Miscellaneous Size of User Base Mentions (List)

Miscellaneous User Base/Market Share/Demand/Popularity/Return

- 022 Other Miscellaneous User Base/Market Share/Demand/Popularity/Return Mentions (List)

Demographics/Description of User Base (Net)

- 023 Target market/demographic/who is the audience/customer
- 024 (Are) Users more affluent/have more spending power
- 025 Has a focus on business/business users
- 026 Other Demographics/Description of User Base Mentions (List)

Development Issues (Net)**Time/Effort of Development (SubNet)**

- 027 Ease of use/ease/difficulty of development
- 028 Ease of learning language/how fast can I learn the system/language
- 029 Time required/time to market
- 030 Integration/ease/ability of adapting current code to different platforms
- 031 Other Time/Effort of Development Mentions (List)

TRG 15151 Application Developers

January 26, 2016

Development Costs (SubNet)

- 032 Cost to develop
- 033 Costs less to develop for that platform/operating system
- 034 Cost of development tools/fees required to develop for that program
- 035 (Is it) Free/no cost for tool/license
- 036 (If I) already had the computer/didn't not need to get another computer
- 037 Other Development Costs Mentions (List)

Support/Development Environment (SubNet)

- 038 Support/resources available
- 039 Development environment/is it environmentally friendly
- 040 Documentation/availability/quality of documentation
- 041 Development/integration tools available/what is the SDK/API access
- 042 Framework/is there a framework available to develop applications
- 043 Examples/test environments/other applications I could look at/learn from
- 044 Other Support/Development Environment Mentions (List)

Programming Language (SubNet)**Familiarity with Platform/Language (Sub-SubNet)****Java (Sub-Sub-SubNet)**

- 045 It's Java/(Android is) built on Java
- 046 Have experience with Java/used Java before
- 047 Easy to transition to because it's Java-based
- 048 Easy to pick up because it's similar to Java
- 049 Easy to program for because it's Java/Java-based
- 050 Samsung supports Java language
- 051 Was learning the language for Android which was Java so it was easy
- 052 Learned Java in school
- 053 Easy to develop with Java on Android
- 054 Standard Java-based language

Miscellaneous Familiarity with Platform/Language

- 055 Had exposure to it already/already knew the language/built on a language I already knew
- 056 Worked (exclusively) on that platform since school/throughout my career
- 057 Other Miscellaneous Familiarity with Platform/Language Mentions (List)

Miscellaneous Programming Language

- 058 Programming language (of platform)/like the programming language
- 059 Other Miscellaneous Programming Language Mentions (List)

Miscellaneous Development Issues

- 060 Availability of developers to work on platform/project
- 061 Other Miscellaneous Development Issues Mentions (List)

Platform (Net)

- 062 The platform/what platform it's built on
- 063 Operating system of platform
- 064 (Is) Platform open/is it open-source
- 065 It was new/a new platform/was curious about platform
- 066 Why they chose the platform/what makes platform new/different
- 067 Capabilities of platform
- 068 Security/secure platform
- 069 Other Platform Mentions (List)

January 26, 2016

Device Related (Net)

- 070 Have/like the device (I have an iPhone, fan of Android phones)
- 071 What devices the platform was on
- 072 Features of device: resolution, speakers, etc.
- 073 Other Device Related Mentions (List)

Commitment to Project (Net)

- 074 Marketing plans/how will it be marketed
- 075 (Whether) Company is/was behind project/product
- 076 App store/interface for selling app
- 077 Other Commitment to Project Mentions (List)

Application Specific (Net)

- 078 (Understanding) The application requirements
- 079 Functionality/purpose of application/what they want it to do
- 080 Whether I like it/if it is an app that interests me
- 081 User interface (UI)/experience
- 082 Other Application Specific mentions (List)

Compatibility (Net)

- 083 Compatibility with other devices/operating systems/platforms
- 084 Other Compatibility Mentions (List)

Fit My Interests/Lifestyle (Net)

- 085 Love/enjoy programming
- 086 Wanted to learn/stay fresh/current/keep up with technology/stay relevant
- 087 Something that I found interesting/something I wanted to get into
- 088 Other Fit My Interests/Lifestyle Mentions (List)

Miscellaneous

- 089 The needs of the client/it was my job/client/company requested
- 090 Number of jobs available developing applications on that platform
- 091 Number of other people developing for that program
- 092 The technology/technological potential
- 093 The analytics
- 094 Scalability
- 095 Why I would be doing it/what is the point?/is it worthwhile
- 096 Is it legal/are their copyright issues
- 097 Other Miscellaneous Mentions (List)

- 098 None/Don't know/No others

January 26, 2016

Q2B/3B Reasons Most/Second Most Important Factor**User Base/Market Share/Demand/Popularity/Return (Net)****Size of User Base (SubNet)****Economic Considerations (Sub-SubNet)****Return on Investment (Sub-Sub-SubNet)**

001 Determines/ensures return on investment/knowning you will recoup/not lose your money

002 Would want the most bang for your buck/largest return

003 Other Return on Investment Mentions (List)

Miscellaneous Economic Considerations

004 Financial considerations/it must make financial sense (Unspec)

005 Profitability/want to make money/the product must make money

006 Determines how much money you make/would want larger profits/to make more money

007 Determines/generates (more) business/sales/would want more sales/downloads

008 Determines how fast you make money

009 My livelihood depends on it/I need the work/want to continue working

010 Other Economic Considerations Mentions (List)

Market Growth (Sub-SubNet)

011 Would want/need a growing market/customer base

012 Other Market Growth Mentions (List)

Company Related (Sub-SubNet)

013 Other Company Related Mentions (List)

Miscellaneous Size of User Base

014 Indicates/determines the popularity/size of user base

015 Would want the largest amount of users/to reach as many people as possible

016 Other Miscellaneous Size of User Base Mentions (List)

Miscellaneous User Base/Market Share/Demand/Popularity/Return

017 You want an audience/user base/no use creating an application if no one would use it/buy it

018 We build apps for the users/customers

019 Need to support (any) platforms that customers use

020 Other Miscellaneous User Base/Market Share/Demand/Popularity/Return Mentions (List)

Development Issues (Net)**Time/Effort of Development (SubNet)****Time of Development (Sub-SubNet)**

021 Determines the time it takes/how fast we can work/develop the application

022 It takes time to develop/concerned about the time I'm investing

023 Other Time of Development Mentions (List)

Miscellaneous Time/Effort of Development

024 Determines the effort involved/would want it to be easy to use/develop

025 Programming/development is impossible/too difficult without it

026 Easier if the platform/language is similar to what we already work with

027 Some platforms/frameworks are horrible to use/write for

028 Other Miscellaneous Time/Effort of Development Mentions (List)

TRG 15151 Application Developers

January 26, 2016

Development Costs (SubNet)

- 029 Concerned about the costs/cost of development running high (Unspec)
- 030 Concerned about the budget/need to develop within budget
- 031 Have limited resources (for development)
- 032 Other Development Costs Mentions (List)

Support/Development Environment (SubNet)

- 033 Important to have/need good development/integration tools
- 034 Need a good/friendly infrastructure/support environment
- 035 Other Support/Development Environment Mentions (List)

Programming Language (SubNet)

- 036 Familiarity with the platform/language/prefer to use a language I already know
- 037 Determines/need to know which (new) languages/platforms I have to learn/keep up with
- 038 Would want to reuse existing code (rather than writing from scratch)
- 039 Other Programming Language Mentions (List)

Miscellaneous Development Issues

- 040 Determines how many qualified developers are available/how easy it is to find them
- 041 Other Miscellaneous Development Issues Mentions (List)

Platform (Net)

- 042 I like/am satisfied with other platform/OS/what I use now: Android, Apple/iOS
- 043 Don't (usually) develop for Microsoft/Windows
- 044 Don't (usually) develop for Blackberry
- 045 Want/expect good performance from platform: speed, stability, etc.
- 046 Other Platform Mentions (List)

Commitment to Project (Net)

- 047 Determines investment/funding for the project/would need client/company investment
- 048 Other Commitment to Project Mentions (List)

Application Specific (Net)**Functionality (SubNet)**

- 049 Effects/determines the functionality of the application
- 050 Need/want to improve/upgrade applications/add additional features/functionality
- 051 Mentions of specific applications/functionalities being developed
- 052 Other Functionality Mentions (List)

Miscellaneous Application Specific

- 053 Application needs to be usable/otherwise people couldn't use the app
- 054 Would want application to serve a need/be useful/benefit users
- 055 Would want app to be easy for customers to use/learn
- 056 (For the) user interface/experience
- 057 Other Application Specific Mentions (List)

Compatibility (Net)

- 058 Would want it to run on multiple devices/platforms
- 059 Needs to be mobile compatible/run on mobile devices (as well as desktop)
- 060 Other Compatibility Mentions (List)

January 26, 2016

Miscellaneous

- 061 It's important/necessary (Unspec)
- 062 Based on my experience
- 063 Makes it worthwhile/otherwise it would be a waste of time
- 064 Determines it's success/viability/sustainability
- 065 Problems with hackers/identity theft/data breaches
- 066 Develop applications for/sell to clients/need to satisfy our clients
- 067 Would/might need to scale up/hire more people/developers
- 068 Concerned with the technology being used/if it's new technology
- 069 It's a competitive market/users have many options
- 070 Other Miscellaneous Mentions (List)

- 071 Non-responsive answer

January 26, 2016

Q7/Q8 Reasons for rating capability of learning/creating language**Positive (Grand Net)****I Am Experienced/Know/Can Learn How to Do This (Net)****Background/Experience (SubNet)****Java Experience (Sub-SubNet)**

- 001 Jumped onto Android using Java when I was a proficiency plus programmer
- 002 Have experience with Java
- 003 I was a project manager at micro systems during the development of Java
- 004 We've switched our language to swift and switched from Java to Kotlin
- 005 Every programming language is route at Java Script and Java [DN w/ Skills/Tasks Are Interrelated]

Miscellaneous Background/Experience

- 006 My background/this is what I do/this is my job/specialty
- 007 I have done this before/already know how to do this (learn new languages, write new languages)
- 008 Learn new languages all the time/always learning new stuff/have learned many languages in the past
- 009 I know/have experience with many/multiple languages/platforms
- 010 Other Miscellaneous Background/Experience Mentions (List)

Skills/Tasks Are Interrelated (SubNet)

- 011 Application languages are all similar/once you know one/some/it's easy/possible to learn/create another
- 012 Can implement the application IoC/can use generic/reusable sections
- 013 Other Skills/Tasks Are Interrelated Mentions (List)

Can Learn How to Do It (SubNet)

- 014 I can learn it/can learn the skill/language/can learn new skills
- 015 I'm a fast learner/can learn to do this quickly
- 016 Would be easy to learn/figure out
- 017 Other Can Learn How to Do It Mentions (List)

Miscellaneous I Am Experienced/Know/Can Learn How to Do This

- 018 I/we can do this/have the skills required to do this
- 019 I have confidence in my skills/not a problem for someone with my skill set/I'm a good programmer
- 020 Other Miscellaneous I Am Experienced/Know/Can Learn How to Do This Mentions (List)

Support/Resources (Net)

- 021 There would be (a lot of) support (examples, tutorials, information on the internet)
- 022 Would hire the right/best people/have a large/diverse team
- 023 Other Support/Resources Mentions (List)

Miscellaneous Positive

- 024 I like/don't mind (learning) new technology
- 025 Like/enjoy programming
- 026 Have to be able to keep up/technology moves quickly today
- 027 Easy to use/do/not too difficult
- 028 It's possible/could be done given the right circumstances
- 029 Other Miscellaneous Positive Mentions (List)

January 26, 2016

Reasons Not to Do It (Grand Net)**Have Never Done This/Not in My Skill Set (Net)**

- 030 Have never done this before
- 031 Not really what I do/not that experienced with coding/not a developer
- 032 Don't know how to do this/don't have the skills/knowledge/ability to do this
- 033 Requires interaction with the hardware device/knowledge about hardware that I don't have
- 034 Only know how to work with (multiple) existing languages
- 035 Other Have Never Done This/Not in My Skill Set Mentions (List)

Would Be Difficult to Learn/Do (Net)

- 036 It's not easy/would be difficult
- 037 It would be hard to learn/a huge learning curve
- 038 Developing a (new) language is different/harder/more complicated than merely using a language
- 039 Other Would Be Difficult to Learn/Do Mentions (List)

Not Worthwhile/Wouldn't Bother (Net)

- 040 Have other/more important things to focus on/better ways to spend my time
- 041 Not a worthwhile endeavor/wouldn't relate to anything/no benefit in learning/creating language
- 042 Don't see the point of inventing new a language/better to use an existing language/seems like reinventing the wheel
- 043 Already so many/too many languages out there
- 044 Other Not Worthwhile/Wouldn't Bother Mentions (list)

Miscellaneous Reasons Not to Do It

- 045 Don't want to do this/no interest
- 046 Don't like doing it/not something I would enjoy
- 047 Would be a lot of work
- 048 Too time consuming/don't have the time to do this
- 049 Requires more resources than I have/would need a whole team
- 050 Other Miscellaneous Reasons Not to Do It Mentions (List)

Non-Committal (Grand Net)**Time-Related (Net)**

- 051 Depends on the time/as long as I have the time
- 052 Would take (a long) time/not something that can be done quickly
- 053 Other Time-Related Mentions (List)

Depends on Specifics of Project (Net)

- 054 Depends on the specifics of the project/would need more details to be able to say for sure/rate accurately
- 055 Depends on the language
- 056 Depends on the type of application
- 057 If the language is user-friendly like Java
- 058 Other Depends on Specifics of Project Mentions (List)

Depends on Support/Resources (Net)

- 059 Depends on the documentation/if I have (good) documentation
- 060 I would need help/depends on the help/support I can get
- 061 Other Depends on Support/Resources Mentions (List)

January 26, 2016

Miscellaneous Non-Committal

- 062 Depends if it will be worthwhile/have a future/if it will have a user base
- 063 Depends on the level of difficulty/if not too difficult
- 064 Depends on whether it is modular/backwards API capability
- 065 Would be new to me/hard to say since I haven't done it before
- 066 Wouldn't be 100% ready/know how to do it up to a limit
- 067 Other Miscellaneous Non-Committal Mentions (List)

068 Don't know

EXHIBIT I

1 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
KAREN G. JOHNSON-MCKEWAN (SBN 121570)
2 kjohnson-mckewan@orrick.com
ANNETTE L. HURST (SBN 148738)
3 ahurst@orrick.com
GABRIEL M. RAMSEY (SBN 209218)
4 gramsey@orrick.com
405 Howard Street, San Francisco, CA 94105
5 Tel: 1.415.773.5700 / Fax: 1.415.773.5759
PETER A. BICKS (*pro hac vice*)
6 pbicks@orrick.com
LISA T. SIMPSON (*pro hac vice*)
7 lsimpson@orrick.com
51 West 52nd Street, New York, NY 10019
8 Tel: 1.212.506.5000 / Fax: 1.212.506.5151

9 BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
DAVID BOIES (*pro hac vice*)
10 dboies@bsflp.com
333 Main Street, Armonk, NY 10504
11 Tel: 1.914.749.8200 / Fax: 1.914.749.8300
STEVEN C. HOLTZMAN (SBN 144177)
12 sholtzman@bsflp.com
1999 Harrison St., Ste. 900, Oakland, CA 94612
13 Tel: 1.510.874.1000 / Fax: 1.510.874.1460

ORACLE CORPORATION
14 DORIAN DALEY (SBN 129049)
dorian.daley@oracle.com
15 DEBORAH K. MILLER (SBN 95527)
deborah.miller@oracle.com
16 MATTHEW M. SARBORARIA (SBN 211600)
matthew.sarboraria@oracle.com
17 RUCHIKA AGRAWAL (SBN 246058)
ruchika.agrawal@oracle.com
18 500 Oracle Parkway,
Redwood City, CA 94065
19 Tel: 650.506.5200 / Fax: 650.506.7117

20 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
ORACLE AMERICA, INC.

21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
22 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
23 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

24 ORACLE AMERICA, INC.
25 Plaintiff,
26 v.
26 GOOGLE INC.
27 Defendant.

Case No. CV 10-03561 WHA
**EXHIBITS D, G, AND I TO EXHIBIT 9
TO THE DECLARATION OF
ANDREW D. SILVERMAN**

Hearing: April 27, 2016, 8:00 a.m.
Dept.: Courtroom 8, 19th Floor
Judge: Honorable William H. Alsup

MANUAL FILING NOTIFICATION

Regarding: Manually Filed Portions of Exhibit 9 to the Declaration of Andrew D. Silverman in Support of Oracle's Motions in Limine

This filing is in physical form only, and is being maintained in the case file in the Clerk's office. If you are a participant on this case, this filing will be served shortly.

For information on retrieving this filing directly from the Court, please see the Court's main web site at <http://www.cand.uscourts.gov> under Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ).

This filing was not efiled for the following reason(s):

☐ Unable to Scan Documents

☐ Physical Object (please describe):

☐ Non-Graphic/Text Computer File (audio, video, etc.) on CD or other media

☐ Item Under Seal in Criminal Case

☐ Conformance with the Judicial Conference Privacy Policy (General Order 53)

☒ Other (please describe): Exhibits D, G, and I to the Expert Report of Dr. Itamar Simonson, attached as Exhibit 9 to the Declaration of Andrew D. Silverman, are Microsoft Excel spreadsheets containing a significant amount of data in many cells across multiple sheets. If printed or converted to a PDF file, the documents would span many pages and would be unwieldy to use.

Dated: March 23, 2016

ORRICK, HERRINGTON &
SUTCLIFFE LLP

By: 

ANDREW D. SILVERMAN

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ORACLE AMERICA, INC.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within-entitled action. My business address is Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP, 1000 Marsh Road, Menlo Park, California 94025. On March 23, 2016, I served the following document(s):

**NOTICE OF MANUAL FILING RE: PORTIONS OF
EXHIBIT 9 TO THE DECLARATION OF ANDREW D.
SILVERMAN IN SUPPORT OF ORACLE'S MOTIONS IN
LIMINE**

**MANUALLY FILED PORTIONS OF EXHIBIT 9 TO THE
DECLARATION OF ANDREW D. SILVERMAN**

on the interested parties in this action by electronic service [Fed. Rule Civ. Proc. 5(b)] by electronically mailing true and correct copies to: DALVIK@kvn.com

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on March 23, 2016, at San Francisco, California.



José E. Valdés